

*Supply—National Defence*

for the Sabre jets. It is not a serious mistake, but it is an obvious one.

Then, as reported at page 1418, he speaks about the personnel carrier. I will read the hon. gentleman's words:

The introduction of the M.113 armoured personnel carrier to our NATO brigade group in Europe is now nearly complete. This has given the brigade group a greatly enhanced operational capability and, for the first time the armoured protection it would need in the face of a fully mechanized opponent.

I agree it gives them greater operational capability. But it is simply ignorance on the part of the minister, or whoever wrote this for him, to say that it would for the first time provide the armoured protection needed "in the face of a fully mechanized opponent". Incidentally, the word "mechanized" as applied to these units dropped out about 25 years ago. Today we speak of "armoured formations" and "armour". It is completely wrong. An armoured personnel carrier gives the infantry inside it protection against small arms fire, mortar fire and small fragments of shells but it does not give them any protection at all against tanks and the missiles which come from tanks. These will go through an armoured personnel carrier like a knife through butter. For the minister to indicate that this carrier gives troops protection in the face of a fully mechanized opponent is completely wrong and misleading. It shows gross ignorance and I am surprised he should have introduced such a sentence in a description of an armoured personnel carrier. The armoured personnel carrier used in the second world war was a much heavier machine and a German 88 millimeter shell would pierce it as easily as one would tear a piece of paper.

● (3:50 p.m.)

Why the minister should be responsible for that I do not know, except that most of the time he does not know what he is talking about.

This morning at the question period I asked the Prime Minister what progress was being made about negotiating out of the nuclear role, something which he promised three years ago. In his reply, and I quote his words, he said:

As my hon. friend, the Minister of National Defence indicated last night . . . we are at present doing just that.

But there was nothing in the minister's speech last night to indicate there is any attempt whatsoever to negotiate out of the

[Mr. Churchill.]

nuclear role. That was the promise made by the Prime Minister prior to the 1963 election, but nothing has been done in the three years that have followed. If something had been done we would have heard from the Prime Minister, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, or the Minister of National Defence. I have been asking that question in one form or another for the last three years, and I have been brushed off. That promise is just another one of the unfulfilled promises of the Prime Minister.

Let me draw attention to the Minister of National Defence and his position in 1961. He was then sitting in opposition and was very critical of the then minister, the hon. member of Calgary North. He was critical about the equipment that should be bought for the Canadian forces, and you will find these words of his recorded at page 8230 of *Hansard* of September 12, 1961:

It is interesting to note that in the long list of priority items presented by President Kennedy to Congress on March 28 last there did not appear one of the major items on which the Canadian government is relying. Not one American penny for the Voodoo, the F-104, the Bomarc or the Honest John. The Canadian defence department has become a pawnshop for second hand American hardware.

That was the minister in 1961. He has retained all this second hand American hardware ever since, and he has been acquiring more.

Quite a bit has been said about this plane, the Super F-5, or whatever it is called. Let us see what is said about that by James Eayrs, professor of political economy at the University of Toronto, author of a book "In Defence of Canada," who wrote in an article in *The Globe Magazine* on October 23, 1965:

The Canadian government has recently contracted to purchase for the R.C.A.F. more than 100 Northrop Freedom Fighters, the Super F-5. A recruiting advertisement of the Department of National Defence describes it thusly:

"The Super F-5 is just one of the many new exciting things that's happening in the air, on the ground and at sea in the Canadian forces. Fast, versatile, and rugged, the Super F-5 is an ideal partner for our ground forces. Operating from sod fields, it's deployed right up front where the action is, ready to step in and back up Canadian troops—with authority."

It is obvious that this description of a strategic role for an extensive new weapons system is a complete fantasy. I don't doubt for a moment that the aircraft can take off from sod fields and the rest of it; but there is nothing in Canada's military position to suggest that it will ever be called upon to do so.

A few weeks ago, I chanced to meet a senior official of the Northrop Corporation, who told me that there was joy and amazement in Beverly Hills