

Supply—Defence Production

in the debate of May 27, 1966, has been unacceptable. I deliberately use that word because it is one of the Prime Minister's favourites. When he used it as a private member of the chamber I sometimes agreed with him. But in this matter under discussion, and we are considering the little empire that is now ruled over by the minister, the government's action is unacceptable.

Let us examine the general estimates for 1967-68. The department spent \$7,015,000 directly and \$1,240,600 indirectly. In other words, the department last year cost Canada's taxpayers nearly \$8.5 million. I know that includes the corporate affairs part of the department, and this amount cannot all be ascribed to new offices and the operation of the new department.

Mr. Turner: May I ask a question?

Mr. Alkenbrack: When I have finished, Mr. Chairman. For this fiscal year it is estimated that the department will spend \$8,606,500 directly and \$1,403,500 indirectly—well over \$10 million. After having been granted nearly \$20 million over two years the department is asking in these supplementary estimates for another handout of \$683,753. Since its inception the department has not done anything to bring down living costs. Neither has it brought forward a single measure of legislative value to help the workingman, the farmer, the old age pensioner, the veteran, or the man on a fixed income. If this supplementary request is passed the department with its luxury empire of wall to wall carpets will have cost our taxpayers nearly \$21 million. That is one reason why so many people across the country are dissatisfied with the government. That is why the consumer citizens of Canada are determined to change and rectify the situation at their next electoral opportunity.

An hon. Member: Are you kidding?

Another hon. Member: Six o'clock.

Mr. MacEachen: I rise on a point of order to speak of a matter that I mentioned last night. At eight o'clock we shall continue with the estimates of the Departments of Defence Production and Industry and then with the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and so on. It was understood that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs would not be in the house at eight o'clock.

An hon. Member: Where will he be?

The Chairman: The questions listed for debate on tonight's adjournment motion are as follows: the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), Consumer Affairs—hearing aids—request for inquiry into prices; the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. McCleave), Canadian Broadcasting Corporation—alleged suppression of filmed interview with Nigerian official; the hon. member for Cape Breton North and Victoria (Mr. Muir), Labour Conditions—North Sydney, Nova Scotia—request for assistance for dock workers.

It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair.

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Chairman: Order. House again in committee of supply, Supplementary Estimates (C), 1967-68, of the Department of Defence Production. The details will be found on page 6 of the supplementary estimates. Vote 6c.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENCE PRODUCTION

6c. Reimbursement of the Defence Production Revolving Fund established by Section 16(1) of the Defence Production Act for losses sustained in the operation of the Crown-owned magnesium foundry at Haley, Ontario, prior to its sale in December, 1967, \$480,000.

Mr. McIntosh: Mr. Chairman, I first became interested in this vote 6c in the estimates of the Department of Defence Production when I noted that it mentioned the sale of public property. The reason I am particularly interested in it is because recently the Minister of National Defence, or his department, saw fit to disband the local unit in my area, the Fourteenth Canadian Hussars. I will not go into the reasons, or what I think of the action of the government in this respect, but with the disbandment of that unit it left two armouries surplus in my constituency, one in Swift Current and one in Maple Creek.

To give a little of the history of the building of these armouries I would point out that I believe the land in both cases was given to the Department of National Defence for a nominal sum, I think the sum of \$1. Now that the armouries are no longer used by the unit, naturally the municipalities in which they are situated are concerned about what is going to happen to them. As a result of their concern and their contacting me, I wrote to the Minister of National Defence and asked him if he