

received while listening to some very able people speaking this afternoon—people who are not necessarily more able than some others who spoke, but they have been around here for a long time and they are or have been members of the committee on defence. I am thinking of the hon. member for Calgary North, the hon. member for Vancouver East, the hon. member for Mégantic and the hon. member for Greenwood. They are all familiar with the Minister of National Defence and they all expressed disillusionment. This is what has happened after almost three years of this minister being in office. I was disillusioned with him before he ever took office, because I listened to him when he was sitting on the opposition benches and I heard his extravagant and irresponsible statements with regard to national defence. I will read out some of them to the committee this afternoon if I have time. When I was on the standing committee on defence in 1963 I was profoundly disappointed because one could get no information from the minister at all. The other members I have mentioned have reached the stage of complete disillusionment with this minister and the policy of his department.

Yet I do not know of any minister in the present government who has carried on a more extended campaign of grandiloquent praise. Everything, according to him, is better. Everything is more efficient. Everything is saving money. Whoever is working for him in public relations must be getting an annual bonus, because the minister is paraded across this country on radio, on television and in the press as being the wonder boy of the Liberal party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Churchill: Wait till the Minister of Finance and some of those other people who are interested in the leadership hear that. There was quite a bit of applause this afternoon from those benches for this man.

It has been a great build-up. There has been a lot of talk about all the wonderful things which have been done in the department of defence. But today we have had an analysis of the failure of this minister. The balloon has been pricked. I will deal with that in a few moments.

There has been far too much propaganda across this country with regard to our national defence. People have been bemused. I doubt whether there is one person in a thousand who understands what is meant by

Supply—National Defence

integration and unification. We have had no explanation today from the associate minister. He said this was all in the White Paper. I have the White Paper in front of me. We shall see whether it is explained in that document. We were told about the great saving of money which would be realized. Well, the minister will have an opportunity to put the facts in front of this committee before we finish examining these estimates. Let us have the facts and the figures, not a general statement.

The hon. member for Calgary North said the saving of money which had been effected for diversion to the acquisition of military equipment or, to use a colloquialism in which the minister indulges, hardware, is lower than it was seven years ago. It is down to 12 per cent. Yet a few years ago the minister was complaining, in opposition, that insufficient money was available for the purchase of military equipment.

Look at the White Paper. This is what hon. members will find on page 19: "Sufficient savings should accrue from unification to permit a goal of 25 per cent of the budget to be devoted to capital equipment." Let the minister put the facts and the figures in front of us, instead of propaganda which is going out in this country, building him up. I say it is not true. If it is true, the minister can disclose to this committee by giving us actual figures whether he has reached this figure of 25 per cent or not.

The minister's speech yesterday was a soporific speech. As the member for Calgary North said, the hon. gentleman seems to have lost all his vitality. He was worn out. Perhaps he should be shifted to some other portfolio. There was no drive or vitality in his speech yesterday—or perhaps he was trying to drag it out so that the hon. member for Calgary North could not take the floor to reply to him.

What was contained in that speech of the minister's last night? It was just a rehash of administrative action, to use an expression which the hon. gentleman himself has used. And there were some mistakes in it. I will point out two mistakes right now. I presume the minister wrote his own speech. In any case he has to take responsibility for it. On page 1419 of *Hansard* he is reported as saying "—from the very first days of our air division in Europe; first flying Sabre jets and then CF-100's—". He has put them in that order. But the CF-100's were retired to make way