

*Supply—National Defence*

• (2:00 p.m.)

I should like to refer also to the Zambian oil lift. We were good fellows and immediately sent some of our Hercules aircraft to help transport oil to Zambia. How long is this airlift going to continue? Is it effective? Are the reports that Zambia is allowing oil supplies to go into Rhodesia true? Are we just wasting the taxpayers' money without really accomplishing anything? This is the political side of questions which relate to defence policy and the defence budget. We are concerned that there should be some useful purpose for these programs.

I think mention should be made at this point of our training program for some nations in Africa, specifically Ghana and Tanzania, with relation to the current year's budget. Here is an area where our defence policy again combines with external affairs policy and we can make a tremendous contribution. I have seen personally what some of our men are doing out there and it causes one to be proud of the way Canadians fit into such a picture, create good will and make a fine contribution. I feel that this boosts morale. I think we should have a similar pattern of purpose and definition of objectives with regard to other areas of our defence program. Then we could give up just flailing our arms in the wind and accomplishing nothing worth while.

What about the whole NATO program? Has Europe today reached the point where the military objectives of NATO are antiquated? Is it not reasonable to assume that with the European countries having progressed politically and economically as they have and with the new pattern of defence programs as well as the increasing mobility of defence forces it is no longer necessary to spend millions of dollars in order to keep forces in Europe? I am not suggesting for one moment that we should shirk our responsibility to NATO. Here again, there is the possibility we are just drifting along and spending money without really accomplishing anything and at the same time wasting tax dollars.

I think we all agree that the new role of NATO relates more to the economic side than it does to defence. Could not some of our forces be brought home? Could they not fulfil any obligation in the event of a crisis in Europe from this side of the Atlantic as well as they could from that side? I should like to hear more about this. The minister really has not said anything about it. This is one of the

major parts of our over-all defence expenditure and I think we should hear more about it.

I believe that one of the weak spots of the defence department is its lack of public relations. They never inform members of this house or the public about what is happening. For example, there is the case of the F-5 fighter which is apparently being adopted by the defence department. According to news stories across the country this fighter has been rejected by the United States. The general public opinion, as near as I can determine, is that the purchase of this plane is a waste of money. If the department were more concerned about issuing constructive information concerning this plane, perhaps there would be a different opinion.

When I was going through some newspaper clippings I was amazed to find that nine allied air forces have purchased the same airplane. If they have done this there may be some advantage to it about which the public and the defence committee are not aware. According to one of these reports which appeared in December of last year, nine allied air forces have ordered some 700 F-5's. This is the same plane that we know as the CF-5. These countries are Canada, China, Greece, Iran, Korea, Norway, the Philippines, Spain and Turkey. This is the kind of information I think we should have and it is the responsibility of the defence department to see that we get it. Certainly the public have to have such information if the defence department expects the taxpayer to make his contribution to defence expenditures willingly.

These criticisms do not apply only to aircraft. We have heard criticisms in the house about the Bomarc missile. We cannot blame the present government for the fact that Bomarcs are in Canada. This was part of the defence policy crisis three years ago. Is it true that United States defence forces have discarded the Bomarc? Are they phasing it out and using it temporarily until something else takes its place? I should like an answer from the minister. If the Bomarc has no worth then it should be discarded. If it has we should be given this kind of information because it is the kind of information the country needs. I suggest the minister make sure this is done. After all, the original purpose of the defence committee was to secure such information. I am sure many of us here recall vividly the situation three years ago so far as defence policy was concerned. We did not know what defence policy