

Supply—National Defence

strike role for our squadrons in Europe and it would be completed this year. Talk about a two-faced Janus, talk about going in both directions at once. This is not only ebullient extrovertism but political effervescence. We, sir, have a right to know more than generalities. We have a right to know because it costs us at least a billion and a half dollars a year for national defence. What is the defence policy of Canada? We are entitled to know what has never yet been explained, why it is that Canada must spend hundreds of millions of dollars to make Canada a junkyard for obsolete United States equipment.

• (1:00 p.m.)

If we check back over the years, what do we find? We find that we buy that which has been declared obsolete by the United States, what is no longer used as equipment by United States forces. Spokesmen from the office of the minister and the minister himself have much to say; yet they never explain these facts. It is never explained why official spokesmen from the minister's staff and the minister himself righteously and piously say, "No nuclear war". He is calling on the taxpayers of Canada to put up hundreds of millions of dollars to acquire and maintain equipment in a war which, if he is honest in telling us what he is doing, will never come. I have said before both in this house and in the defence committee that in any outright war there is not going to be an attack by manned bombers.

We may be stupid, Mr. Chairman, in our defence policy, but anyone who is going to start a world war is not going to be stupid in his plans for such a war. The question of manned bombers coming across Canada is eyewash. The minister knows it is pure undiluted eyewash. The next war, if it comes, will be fought with missiles. So what do we do? The United States, during the term of office not only of this minister but of the previous minister, declares that Bomars are obsolete, so we buy them. The United States Air Force declares Voodoos obsolete, so we throw out our chests and say we are going to give the R.C.A.F. modern equipment and we buy Voodoos.

Even if manned bombers came across Canada I imagine the pilots would know where our two Bomarc stations were. All they would have to do would be to fly 425 miles away from them in which event we could not touch them. I understand from an answer given by the minister the other day

that it costs \$3.5 million just to provide for personnel and the employment of dogs to protect our nuclear warhead installations for a type of war that will never take place. Surely, Mr. Chairman, the members of this House of Commons and the people of Canada are entitled to a more efficient and practical defence policy than that outlined by the minister. Surely the members of this House of Commons are entitled to something more than generalities. We are entitled to facts and to explanations.

When I speak of Canada being a high-priced junkyard for United States obsolescence I think not only of Voodoos and Bomars. I suggest that some questions must also be raised, as was done by the speaker before me, about the new Northrop F-5. It is not good enough for the minister to tell us what a wonderful aircraft it is and what a wonderful buy he is making. He is billing the Canadian taxpayers for \$215 million. It is a new piece of equipment. Yet on January 24 of this year the President of the United States in his message to Congress said that the Northrop F-5 would not be on their schedule. He stated the U.S. air force would procure more McDonnell F-4's and the Ling-Temco-Vought A-7's, the two aircraft which were rejected by the Minister of National Defence when he was considering the purchase of planes for Canada.

I am not going to take time by repeating much of what was said by the previous speaker but, Mr. Chairman, I always insist on being completely honest. Let it be noted that in a report concerning the testing of the Northrop plane in Viet Nam, written by C. M. Plattner who was in Viet Nam, he opened his statement by saying that the over-all performance of the Northrop F-5 light jet fighter met or surpassed certain expectations. However, as a result of the test he pointed out certain failures. One of these failures was the tendency of the guns to jam and difficulties with the bomb release mechanism were revealed early in the testing. The range is limited with even a moderate-sized bomb load. He goes on to say:

The F-5A in standard configuration—ordnance plus a 150-gallon centreline tank and two 50-gallon wing tip tanks—has a range that is considerably less than that of other tactical jet aircraft in the theatre . . .

Take-off roll is excessive—

The aircraft requires a 6,000 foot runway and I understand that this type of fighter should not require more than 4,000 feet. We are entitled to know, at a time when orders