

*National Defence Act Amendment*

years. With the greatest respect to the Minister of National Defence, and he knows that I have respect for him, I do not think his image as potential leader of that party has been enhanced by that kind of drivel.

What went on in the defence committee? We heard the Minister of National Defence time and time again—as we have heard him in the last two or three years—criticize the hon. member for Calgary North and the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre in respect of defence matters. The minister has said he can save the country money. He has said this right across our nation. This has been his great sales talk. He has said, "I can save the taxpayers of this country money because I am an expert and can streamline defence."

Even though the Minister of Transport does not agree with Air Marshal Miller, Air Marshal Miller had something to say about the saving of money in the area of defence. Let us look at page 2297 of the Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the committee on national defence. Air Chief Marshal Miller was asked this question by a former minister of national defence, the hon. member for Calgary North:

Do you, yourself, see any financial advantage accruing from the proposed scheme of unification?

What was the answer? Air Chief Marshal Miller replied:

There are no significant financial advantages whatsoever as far as I can see.

Naturally the Minister of Transport had to say that we cannot accept the evidence of these experts. He asked, who are they to pass opinions? They only served 30 or 40 years in the services. Then the Minister of Transport said that they pushed aside these men of experience in the first war and put in young people in the second war. When the former minister of national defence asked him to name the great generals of the second world war, he could not name them. His argument fell flat on its face, as have his words across this nation. What else did he say about that subject? As reported at page 2302 of the committee proceedings, the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona asked this question:

In fact, sir—I am going away out on a limb here—was there any thought in your mind or did you have any evidence on which to base an opinion that unification itself had any hope of achieving any sort of substantial savings in itself, at all?

Once again Air Marshal Miller said, "No." How, then, can the Minister of National Defence continue to peddle that sort of drivel

[Mr. Woolliams.]

across the nation and say that this program, no matter how dear and close it is to his heart, will save the taxpayers' money? The proof of the pudding is in the eating. The estimates of the minister's department have been published, and the budget for defence is up by \$150 million.

**An hon. Member:** It is \$115 million.

**Mr. Woolliams:** Somebody says it is up by \$115 million. I see that the minister is laughing. What is \$115 million to him? If he thinks an increase of \$115 million is a lesser sum than \$150 million, in this context, he and I went to different schools. Then we have the great cross-examiner, the hon. member for Kootenay East. I would never want the hon. member to be beside me in the defence of any case, because if I were defending he would be the most powerful prosecution attorney one could imagine. If you are defending and want to make a point for the prosecution, you put Byrne in. Listen to this one. This is a dinger. This will be quoted in our law schools across Canada for time immemorial. He really brings this matter to a head for the Liberal government. I congratulate him, because he has put this matter in the proper perspective. This is the kind of cross-examination I have always dreamed of but hoped it would never happen to me. The hon. member for Kootenay East asked this powerful question:

Then, do you believe that the implementation of Bill C-243 would result in significant demoralization of the various forces?

This was most potent cross-examination of Air Marshal Miller:

Then, do you believe that the implementation of Bill C-243 would result in significant—

I like that word.

—demoralization of the various forces?

That has been our argument. That is the great question. What did Air Chief Marshal Miller say when answering that question put by the prosecution? He said:

If rushed, I would think so.

What a question, and what an answer. This is where I rest our case, Mr. Chairman. I am glad to see the chairman of the defence committee, the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, wave at me from across the way. He made a great speech. He said that this bill, with all its clauses, means nothing. He said it merely changes the name of the forces, and that the feelings of the serving men and their morale are nothing. The hon. member says we