

in about equal proportions—joy that the Canadians had bought the F-5 in such large quantities, amazement that we would have any useful purpose for it.

We will let the minister and the associate minister think that one over. Other evidence has been produced this afternoon with regard to that machine. I wonder will the minister tell us on Monday, using his words, that, "the Canadian defence department has become a pawnshop for second hand American hardware."

**Mr. Winch:** I said a junkyard, not a pawnshop.

**Mr. Churchill:** I was using a more polished phrase.

This morning the hon. member for Calgary North exposed the weakness of the minister's position when he talked about low morale, loss of manpower, shortage of equipment, disruptions in the lines of communication under the new organization system, the ineffectiveness of the naval program, the great mistake with regard to the F-5, and the corresponding error with regard to the simulator which apparently the Department of National Defence ordered through the Department of Defence Production, and they are having their own internal war to decide who did what, and when, and why.

**Mr. Winch:** Is it not correct that it was never ordered?

**Mr. Churchill:** Perhaps the minister will clear this up for us when he has a chance to speak. But with all the study groups that are operating in the department, with all the slide rules and computers available, you would think no mistake would be made. Whenever anything crops up the minister or the associate minister says, "Let's set up a study group." I would like to have a return showing the number of study groups set up in the department over the last three years. I wonder whether the officers, non-commissioned officers and men have been doing anything else except working on study groups and in seminars. I wonder do they ever do any training. They must be terribly unfit physically if they are sitting around studying all the time. Apparently there was no study group to deal with the simulator, and so they messed it up.

Two years ago, when the minister was changing the set-up and arranging to have a commander in chief, a supremo as we called

### *Supply—National Defence*

him, who would operate with an advisory council, I drew attention to the trouble that would be encountered. Now I understand the minister has set himself up as commander in chief of the Canadian forces. If the information I have is accurate, and I think it is because it comes from a very responsible source, the minister is taking upon himself to retire very senior officers against the advice of other senior officers, to make promotions against the advice or without the advice of his advisers, and generally to act as a commander in chief.

Where does this put the chief of staff? On July 6, 1964, I drew attention to the trouble that might arise under such circumstances. I said:

If the supreme commander is adamant, what does the minister do? On the one hand, the minister becomes just a satellite of the supreme commander and has to take his word for everything. On the other hand, if the minister enforces his will on the supreme commander and tries to get him to do something contrary to his military experience, the supreme commander either becomes a tool or puppet of the minister or he resigns and you have an upset in the system.

● (4:00 p.m.)

Are we reaching that stage where there is a conflict of interest between the chief of staff and the Minister of National Defence? What is going to happen? This is a weakness of the present system that the minister has set up, and these weaknesses are beginning to show. Who is the satellite and who is the puppet as between these two men?

I mention in passing that the minister has given no report whatsoever with regard to the NATO conferences that have been held during the two years when we have not had an opportunity to receive a report in this house. As the hon. member for Greenwood has asked, what commitments were made at the last NATO conference, and what are we committed to for the next several years? The minister should report in that regard.

I shall conclude my remarks on this occasion, if I have some time left, by dealing with the brigade in Europe and the question of its mobility. When the minister was here on the opposition side he talked about the mobility of that brigade in Europe. I talked about it years before that when we were formerly in opposition. I wonder what he has done about it. The only mobility that he appears to have applied to that brigade in the three years he has been in office relates to the addition of the armoured personnel carriers. I raised the question about armoured personnel carriers