

Over there in their debates detailed information is seldom sought or given. The debate is of a general character, and as a rule the minister concerned speaks only once or twice giving general replies to the questions that are put.

Reference has been made to the committee on estimates in the United Kingdom. A sub-committee is set up to deal with defence estimates, but it has not made a report this year. The House of Commons passed the appropriation with respect to defence without having before it any report from the committee on estimates. As hon. members who are familiar with it know, the committee on estimates deals largely with the form of the estimates and matters of that kind, never with policy; in fact consideration of questions of policy is expressly excluded in the terms of reference of the committee. Now let me tell hon. members in a general way that we have in the administrative and training staff across Canada the personnel necessary to administer and train, first of all the active forces, then the reserve forces, and particularly the officers for the active and reserve forces.

At the moment we have in training for the army alone a total of 3,090, of whom 374 are undergoing general military training; 1,143 are for active force units; 18 are for reserve corps—these figures were given before summer training for the reserve forces had begun—124 are for command contingent officers training corps, and 1,431 for university officers training corps.

We have in the various schools and static units across Canada a total of approximately 16,000 officers and men. This group is necessary because it has the most important job of training the reserve army as well as the active army. Altogether there are 255 active units and 524 reserve units. If the details of the estimates are examined, it will be found there are relatively small amounts of money set down for the reserve army. This is because these items cover only pay and allowances of personnel, transportation of personnel and repairs and maintenance of armouries carried out locally. Those figures do not include any amount for the active forces or for equipment; yet a large part of the role of the active forces is the training and equipping of the reserve units.

I was asked by the leader of the opposition on this and other occasions if we could not give greater details of the defence estimates than we are giving. We shall be very glad indeed to give any details that can possibly be given. As has been intimated on other occasions, the Department of Finance, the treasury officials and the Auditor General have had the form of the estimates under consid-

Supply—National Defence

eration, as has this department. I should like to point out that the details given for the defence estimates on page 168 are much more complete than those given in the year 1947-48, when all the details appeared on something less than a page. At that time we were developing the post-war organization, and it was exceedingly difficult to estimate accurately for the following year. The details for this year will be found at pages 168 to 174 of the estimates. Those details are, I believe, more complete than those given for the last year before the war, 1938-39, subject to one exception, that for 1938-39 details are given concerning the civilian employees involved. There are several pages covering civilian employees in the different categories. It did not seem to the officers of the Department of Finance, treasury, and ourselves that that had any significance or usefulness; therefore the details were not given this year. They are, however, available if any hon. member wants them at any time. Subject only to this qualification, the form of the estimates and details given is much more complete than for the estimates of 1938-39. If we can properly give more information that will be useful, then we shall try to work in that direction.

In this connection I should like to say that I do not know of any information given about defence in the United Kingdom or Australia or any countries of the commonwealth which is more complete than that given in this house. From my examination of the statements, and from my following of the debates in other parliaments, I believe we give much more information than any of those countries. With regard to the United States I believe that if hon. members will follow the matter closely they will see that in the actual debates in congress, as in the proceedings before congressional committees, no more detailed information is given than is given here. What creates the impression of more information being given there is information which comes from sources outside of congress, which frequently has no official authority accredited to it, though it may come from some authoritative sources. I suggest in all sincerity that when we are charged with not giving information comparable to that given in other countries, an examination of the facts will show we give just as much as any other country, except possibly the United States and I believe that even in that case we are in a position to compare favourably.

We have had three days of general discussion, including a fourth day when defence matters came up on a motion to set up a committee; therefore this is really the fifth day upon which we have been dealing with defence. Throughout that period I have been