

80,000 or 85,000 people in the armed forces and who knows what the number will be by 1972? In 1964 when the last defence white paper was published, the Canadian forces numbered about 120,000 and today we are on our way to 80,000. What will this mean to our new defence posture? We will have to wait and see. I hope the minister will be able to be more precise when he presents his white paper.

A few things are clear. Four or five years ago with a substantially larger armed force we were scarcely able to meet our multiple tasking assignments, so how can we expect to do it with 80,000 people or probably less in 1972? Where will the minister find the resources and dollars for national sovereignty? Will he turn to the priority established by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in 1969? Will he return to the area of defence of Canada for national sovereignty? If the minister is to lend substance to the posture of the Prime Minister on the question of the defence structure for the '70s he must find the resources and dollars to do it.

Then, we come to the question of NATO. The Prime Minister, our great national dove, is flitting around Russia and I do not know who is putting on the greater show, the Prime Minister or Charlie Lynch in his writings. Time will tell. From the minister's recent comments, it does not seem that we are going to find additional manpower or dollars for NATO. I can anticipate the minister's white paper. If that is his posture I would congratulate him on it. One might think that on an annual review basis we were going to honour our commitment to our NATO allies. I do not see any ground there for getting the resources required for lending effect to the white paper.

The joint US-Soviet statement of intent respecting the desire of those two great nations to arrive at an understanding with respect to the deployment of the ABM's some time this year, will have to lead to a very serious look at our NORAD position. I think the minister's options are now whether we are going to actively participate or whether, in exchange for active participation or a non-capital participation role, we will give to our American allies the advance staging requirements they need with respect to air fields for the AWAC plane carrier and the over the horizon radar program. His options are now more clear but I cannot perceive of the minister, in the next two years, walking away from our NORAD commitment. I can only see a changing emphasis and changing role but not much hope of finding the necessary resources.

If the minister touches Maritime Command, except to expand it, I will shoot him. He must find the manpower and dollars necessary for this area. He must do it not solely on the basis of expanding a paramilitary role to other departmental facilities and capabilities but rather in terms of the capabilities and facilities which continue to come under the direct control of Maritime Command. The problem of ground forces and Mobile Command is well illustrated by the desperate logistics situation we faced during the crisis last fall. What would we have

National Security Measures

done if there had been another call on Mobile Command then? As with Maritime Command this is an area where the minister must expand to change the impact on the direction of forces of training, so that is not a fertile ground either.

The minister needs resources and dollars and cents for a weapons system. I cannot see any way that he can cut back there unless we are to withdraw completely, and I cannot imagine that happening. We have to meet desperately needed weapon requirements. I do not find any great support in cabinet for such programs. Indeed, as I have already indicated, I think there is an inclination toward further retrenchment. In short, I wonder if the white paper will reflect any substantial changes. It should. Surely the world has changed in the last six years and surely the white paper ought to reflect some changes. I am not sure how they will be reflected.

• (12:20 p.m.)

The four broad directives the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) laid down two years ago need implementing. It is the "how" that concerns us at this time. How will we defend our country? Indeed, against whom will we defend it? There is some confusion about that. I wonder how we will participate in NORAD. I wonder how we will participate in NATO with respect to equipment and what will be the thrust of our direction. What will result from an allegedly casual comment by American Secretary of Defence Laird with respect to the \$500 million deficit in our defence productions sharing arrangements? I doubt very much that Defence Secretary Laird made such a comment casually. I doubt whether he made any casual comment during the minister's entire visit. You just do not make casual comments on occasions like that. When my banker says casually that I am overdrawn, he is not being casual; he is being polite and telling me in a nice way to get behind the ball and do something about my overdraft. I wonder to what extent that \$500 million deficit will result in parts of the white paper being written in Washington. For instance, will we buy more Boeing 707's? Will we phase in the 707 to replace the Argus as a long range maritime and northern patrol aircraft? Will we buy that aircraft because it may be the best piece of equipment we can obtain? If it is, let us buy it for that reason and not simply because we happen to enjoy a favourable trade balance with the Americans.

I wonder how the minister, through the medium of the white paper, will deal with the future of the CF-5. Why does he not keep the House and the country advised with respect to the sale of these aircraft? Are the Norwegians interested in it? Are the Venezuelans interested? How will they be used in Canada? Will they be kept for training purposes or will they form part of our commitment to NATO for the defence of the northern flank? I hope that the minister will answer those questions.

I am also wondering what is to happen to our Hydrofoil. What plans are there for building these vessels and selling them? It is a tremendous piece of Canadian equipment that was designed and developed here. I think we ought to be more proud of it and we ought to capitalize more on the research and development dollars we