

Supply—National Defence

and to this committee. We are trying to find out some facts from this minister. No one knows the facts. No one knows what army we have at all, where we are going or what its purpose is. No one knows at this stage whether we are prepared to do our job in the NATO alliance or whether we are unable to do it by virtue of other commitments. After all, we represent in this House of Commons a party that has had something to do with war. It was Laurier who took us into the South African war. It was King who took us into world war II.

An hon. Member: Give us something new.

Mr. Matheson: Those are facts that might well be remembered. Some of these comments which have come from the other side of the chamber and which suggest that the only loyalty in this country comes from the front benches of the government are not fitting and are not proper.

I wish to tell the hon. member that if he wishes to consider records, he can take a look at the record of our own leader who knows something about war. At 17 years of age in 1915 he served in three battle zones, namely Egypt, Gallipoli and the Balkans. He was not in university. He was doing what he has done all his life—serve Canada. We are just a little bit sick of this suggestion that we are not interested in defence, not concerned about the security of Canada and NATO which we had a real part in forming and which we intend to keep strong. In view of the fact that the Chair considers that any discussion of our policy or our military task is out of order, I will sit down. But I think many questions remain unanswered and we are upset about the matter. We are upset about the fact that these large votes come up for consideration without answers. We wonder what chance a young military man has by way of career. There are young military men in our army who are greatly concerned about the line of our defence policy. I could spend some time reading into the record what some of the junior officers of high training have been saying with respect to what kind of army we have. The *Montreal Star* of January 27 says this:

There are a number of younger officers who think it should not—

I am sorry, but I think I had better start at the beginning.

Whether the Canadian forces should have nuclear warheads has been fairly well debated by now on moral grounds. A parallel question has hardly been aired in public at all. It is whether the Canadian army should have them on practical grounds.

There are a number of younger officers who think it should not, because they believe nuclear armament would produce the wrong kind of army for this country.

[Mr. Matheson.]

With its limited population, Canada cannot, in peacetime, field a mass army. It has to produce a specialized force, highly trained for a limited number of functions.

We believe in an elite army. We want to have each and every dollar of the moneys that we have in Canada—in a time of depression, unemployment, and record debt—spent in a way that is going to produce an army of which we shall be proud. In the past we have misspent money and we know it. If it is possible for this government, at the snap of the fingers in a matter of a few days, to decide to scrap a project like the arrow, it is quite possible for them now to pursue a new course with respect perhaps to a wrong line of direction which has been established by some of the defence department. We have, for instance, people like Kissinger, Alastair Buchanan and people like them and some of our own people like John Gellner. What do they say? They say that for the number of troops we have in the field, we have too many at headquarters. They say that with the expenditures that we are voting for Bomarcs, we are not going to have available money with which to develop an elite army. These things we are interested in and that is why I wished to make these few comments.

The Chairman: Shall vote 644 carry?

Mr. Hellyer: Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, I am sure you would not expect the opposition not to continue its investigation into this matter. We can recall when hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the chamber were so greatly concerned over \$1 million in relation to an item of \$1,700 million that they fought a whole election campaign on it and used it to try to smear the reputation of one of the greatest Canadians who ever lived, namely the late Right Hon. C. D. Howe.

Surely we on this side of the chamber have a responsibility to look carefully into how \$35 million should be spent. Also, Mr. Chairman, the matter has a relationship to policy. The whole policy of the Canadian army is actually affected by the whole expenditure of funds under this item. Recently at Edmonton the Prime Minister made this statement: Should war come we must have available the necessary instruments. In the context he was referring to nuclear warheads. I wonder whether the minister would explain what steps have been taken to implement the policy enunciated by the Prime Minister at that time: Should war come we must have the necessary instruments available.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, you have already ruled that a general debate on defence policy is not proper and not in order on this particular item. I therefore do not propose to get into a general discussion of defence