

*Supply—National Defence*

the fact that there is not \$90 million allocated for this purpose. The amount for the construction of buildings and works is only \$49,950,000. The balance is for the purchase of various equipment.

**Mr. Richard (Ottawa East):** I should like to ask the minister what is the thinking of himself and his advisers at the present time in connection with the armouries and defence headquarters in Ottawa? There are so many stories from time to time in the newspapers as to the location of the defence headquarters that I should think that by this time the minister, who is very aggressive, would have something to say. He might indicate to me whether land has been purchased, if it has been decided where the headquarters will be and also whether it is planned to provide Ottawa with a suitable armoury. I am sure that the new members of the house have seen the location of our armouries on Cartier square and realize that they are hardly suitable for the capital and must be moved somewhere else in the near future. I would invite the minister to bring us up to date on this subject.

**Mr. Pearkes:** With respect to a new building for national defence headquarters, there is no money provided for that purpose in these estimates.

**Mr. Richard (Ottawa East):** Or for land?

**Mr. Pearkes:** We will continue to make use of the present building. As far as an armoury is concerned, there are a number of rented buildings as well as the main armoury on Cartier square, and I have to inform the hon. member that there are other places even more badly off than Ottawa for want of armouries.

**Mr. Richard (Ottawa East):** Would the minister inform me if any land has been purchased for the headquarters yet?

**Mr. Pearkes:** No, no land has been purchased for headquarters.

**Mr. Henderson:** I should like to draw the minister's attention to the fact that we need an armoury badly at Dawson Creek. I have mentioned this before. The boys drill down in the cellar of an old school. We have a very good corps there. I have brought this matter to the minister's attention before and I bring it to his attention again tonight and ask him to give it some consideration.

**Mr. Pearkes:** In order to cut the debate short on this particular subject, may I thank practically every member in the house for having at some time or another during this session brought the needs of his militia unit in respect of new armouries to my attention.

Item agreed to.

[Mr. Pearkes.]

Inspection services—

216. Construction or acquisition of buildings, works, land and equipment, \$563,400.

**Mr. Pearkes:** The hon. member for St. Denis asked for information regarding certain land at Nicolet. I am informed that the commune at Nicolet consisted of 3,497 arpents and was purchased by the Department of Transport for \$400,000 under authority of treasury board dated July 28, 1958. The value of the land was determined by specialists employed by the Department of Transport, and the negotiations were carried out by that department. There are no funds allocated in these estimates for the purchase of that land as the deal was concluded and funds provided in last year's estimates.

**Mr. Denis:** Can the minister inform me as to the amount of the municipal assessment on this land?

**Mr. Pearkes:** I am afraid I would not have that because, as I said earlier, the Department of Transport acts as agent in purchasing all land. I hate to have to say it, but I am afraid the hon. member will have to ask the Minister of Transport that question. I suggest that he put the question in the order paper, and then he will be able to get an answer.

**Mr. Denis:** There is something unusual in that answer given by the minister because the estimates of the Department of Transport have been passed. This expenditure belongs to the Department of National Defence, to which minister we are talking. It becomes almost impossible for us to get the information we require. It is a very important question and involves a large amount of money, nearly half a million dollars. We should like to know how it is that an additional appraisal was made by this government when the previous government had already appraised the land and had made an offer which was far less than the amount paid by this government.

I am not saying this new government was extravagant. I know we have been accused in the past of being extravagant, but there is a big margin of difference between what the previous government offered for this land and what this government paid for it. We should like to know why it was necessary to have this land appraised again. I should like to know how much was paid for this new appraisal. I should like to know if the new appraisal was made by an independent person, as happened a little while ago. We should like to know how much the government paid for this appraisal because if the owners were not