

States joint war production committee and of War Supplies Limited, the efficient integration for war purposes of Canadian-American productive capacity has been making satisfactory progress. The new direct arrangements for formalizing a similar United Kingdom-United States relationship should help greatly in organizing the war effort of the united nations as a whole.

The task of working out suitable working arrangements for the effective cooperation of the united nations in the job of winning the war is still incomplete. The creation of the new boards announced this week marks a long step forward in the problem of organization. Through what agencies and representatives our existing cooperation with both the United Kingdom and the United States can most effectively be coordinated with the new United Kingdom-United States boards is receiving the consideration of the government.

Hon. R. B. HANSON (Leader of the Opposition): With the early part of the statement of the Prime Minister I am in agreement. But inasmuch as our food and munitions production in Canada has advanced from the low gear to the second gear stage—we hope that we are now working on all eight cylinders, and in high gear—are we to be left, with respect to these joint boards, with representation by a citizen of the United States, no matter how eminent or capable he may be? Surely Canada has arrived at the stature of a nation, and if there is to be representation it should be by a representative of this government. I am sure the Prime Minister will agree with that and insist upon that position.

Right Hon. W. L. MACKENZIE KING (Prime Minister): I certainly do not take any exception to what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said. All I would point out is that the agreement just concluded between the United States and the United Kingdom was reached within the past day or two. I have no doubt, having regard to our position and to the relationships that we have had both with the British government and with the United States government, that we shall be able to effect some arrangement in connection with food production along the line indicated by my hon. friend.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MALTON AIR FIELD—ROADWAY TO TORONTO

Mr. CHURCH:

1. What steps are being taken by the government to improve the roadway leading to Malton air plant?

2. What contribution did the city of Toronto and the government make to the erection of the air plants at (a) Malton, (b) Toronto island?

3. What use is being made of these plants in connection with the war?

Mr. HOWE:

1. The construction and maintenance of roads to Malton airport is not within the jurisdiction of the Dominion government. A grant of \$25,000, however, was made towards the construction of better highway connections with the city of Toronto by the Department of Transport.

2. The total capital expenditures on the Malton and Island airports are as follows: Expenditure by the city, \$986,000; grant from province of Ontario, \$450,000; expenditure by Department of Transport, \$690,345; expenditure by Trans-Canada Air Lines for hangar, \$135,000.

3. The following use is made of Malton airport: 1. Normal civil air transport services by Trans-Canada Air Lines and American airlines; 2. No. 1, air observer school, and No. 2 elementary flying training school, under the joint air training plan; 3. Testing of aircraft manufactured in the adjoining factories.

The following use is made of Toronto Island airport:

1. The training activities of the Royal Norwegian Air Force.

2. The communications section of the Royal Canadian Air Force for transporting their own personnel.

3. Non-scheduled operations by seaplane and landplane operators.

SASKATCHEWAN COMMUNITY PASTURES

Mr. PERLEY:

1. How many community pastures were established in the province of Saskatchewan during the year 1941?

2. What was the cost of each, (a) acquiring of property or land, (b) fencing, showing average rate per mile?

3. Was any fencing done by contract?

4. If so, what are the names of the contractors and what was the average rate per mile?

Mr. GARDINER:

1. Nine.

2. (a) Nil.

(b) Masfield, L.I.D. No. 17, \$16,295.55, average \$388.00; Lone Tree, No. 18, \$21,929.30, average \$395.12; Lomond, No. 37, \$14,270.85, average \$328.07; Val Marie extension, \$39,818.50, average \$355.72; Shamrock, No. 134, \$17,350.80, average \$301.75; Big Stick, No. 141, \$14,544.98, average \$309.47; Spy Hill,