

show this. Surely, as is pointed out by the institute of radio engineers, prices which could have been secured for this airborne equipment "as is", as they say, would have exceeded the prices secured for the scrap. The article goes on to say:

Any necessary repairs or overhauling would present no problem for an amateur, because I have never seen an amateur station that was not improvised or assembled from discarded equipment which he had repaired.

Then the article goes on to point out what happened about ten years ago, when all ordinary communications in western Canada were broken down, and the railways and others had to depend upon the facilities which the amateurs were able to provide.

I have discussed this matter, because I think the minister should see to it that if there is additional airborne equipment which they intend to dispose of—and I am sure there is plenty of it—the department should make inquiries into the marketing possibilities of the various units as they stand. I know we have set up a committee on war expenditures, and I have no doubt it will do a good job. But it will take a lot of time, and I was advised not long ago that the disposal is taking place to a value of almost \$600,000 a day. It will be realized just what every day means.

I have a keen interest in this matter, because I have received many communications, one of which is from our department of education, and others from school inspectors. These people are keen to secure materials which have been declared to be available. I suggest that they should be given an opportunity to acquire it.

In case there might be any misunderstanding owing to the fact that I have referred frequently to War Assets Corporation, let me say that I have had excellent cooperation from the men in that organization with whom I have had occasion to deal. I do not wish it to be thought for a moment that I have anything against any of them. I say, however, that the machinery for disposal has become so involved that it is breaking down. Hon. members will be surprised when they get the complete and correct picture of the manner in which this machinery operates. I believe the men who are endeavouring to administer it are up against a stone wall. Time is an important factor in this matter, because if the machinery is faulty heavy losses can be sustained by the country in a very short time.

I had not intended discussing the matter this evening, realizing of course that the committee will deal with it. But because of its

[Mr. Shaw.]

urgency and, particularly, the urgency as it applies to airborne equipment, I would ask the minister in all kindness to give consideration to the statement made by the institute of radio engineers. I believe they know what they are talking about.

Mr. ADAMSON: May I speak with regard to equipment which is considered obsolete and has no further operational value. I happened to be in Washington and to see in the Walter Reed hospital—and I believe the same is being done in other hospitals in the United States—how they are using much of the obsolete signals equipment and other intricate equipment to help returned men who require therapy. It has been found in those hospitals that the process of taking apart and putting together the intricate bits of signals and radio equipment does much to help the veteran who is subject to physio-therapy. These are institutions similar to the one in Britannia we visited together the other day.

I suggest that there might be a use for equipment of this kind in that type of institution. I understand they have had great success in using such obsolete equipment in the United States.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I thank my hon. friend for his suggestion. I have been through the Walter Reed hospital. May I say in regard to occupational therapy, for those who have suffered as a result of service overseas, that to-day Canada is as far advanced as any country in the world. As a matter of fact we have been for the last twenty-five years. After the last war we led other countries in the matter of therapy and equipment for it. However, I shall make investigations at once to ascertain whether we are short in any way or in any place of any type of equipment which would be advantageous and, in view of what the hon. member has said, we will take action if such action is necessary.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: In view of what has been said respecting the disposal of surplus equipment, it would seem that we have more of this type of equipment than we need. I notice that this item calls for an expenditure of \$16,724,519 for communications, signals and wireless equipment. My question is this: If we have so much of this type of equipment that we find it necessary to declare it surplus and have it destroyed, why are we asking for more than \$16,000,000 to buy more of the same type? The minister said at page 1802 of *Hansard* of November 2 last, in answer to a question:

It was suggested that the instruments could have been used for instructional work in schools and educational institutions, but I am told by