

*Supply—National Defence*

largely by the decrease in the amount provided for travel and transportation where there was an overestimate of \$128,884 last year.

**Mr. Fulton:** Can the minister say to what extent there is repair by civilian contracts of vehicles, weapons and technical stores under this heading of stores and equipment? I was wondering why R.C.E.M.E. cannot do it all.

**Mr. Claxton:** For the reason that they have more work than they can handle now. We have some 22,000 motor vehicles in the armed forces, and a good many of them are getting well on in years, so that they involve a good deal of repair work. At all the main centres R.C.E.M.E. has more than it can handle and work is allotted to civilian contractors.

**Mr. Harkness:** Under sundries I see "Education of dependent children." I presume that is for children in isolated areas, or something of that sort. Can the minister tell us to what extent the department has provided educational facilities for children?

**Mr. Claxton:** Where there are no educational facilities available such as at Shilo, Borden, Barriefield, Rivers, Chilliwack, Churchill and Whitehorse we have provided some sixteen primary schools to look after 2,200 children of service personnel, and that is the only way we can do it. We regard it as a good and proper way of looking after a natural need.

**Mr. Macdonnell (Greenwood):** When the minister says there are no educational facilities at Barriefield, does he realize that that is practically in the shadow of Queen's university in Kingston?

**Mr. Claxton:** Also I might say the Royal Military College, the National Defence College and the Staff College, but they are not very well equipped to deal with children from five to eleven or twelve years of age.

**Mr. Harkness:** If I remember aright I think the defence department put up a school in Calgary right opposite Currie barracks, as a matter of fact, after some considerable discussion with the city as to whether the city should build the school on adjacent property or whether the army should operate there. I thought that because of the fact that this was probably the general policy the army would operate their own schools wherever there were a considerable number of servicemen. I wonder whether from what the minister says I am to take it that it is not the policy, and that it is only in isolated areas that the schools are being built? Can the minister tell us why it was done in Calgary?

**Mr. Claxton:** My recollection is that when we started the school there it was outside

the municipal limits. Speaking from recollection again we could not persuade the municipality to extend its service there, so we had to do it. Subsequently arrangements were made whereby the work was undertaken by the municipality on our making a payment to the city of Calgary of \$400. I am speaking from memory now, and I am subject to correction.

**Mr. Knight:** Is the school in Churchill in the military camp or on the townsite?

**Mr. Claxton:** At the military camp.

**Mr. Fulton:** Can the minister give us an explanation of the item at the bottom of page 173:

Less—estimated amount required for commitments nominally to fall due during the fiscal year.

I cannot quite understand it as it is set out in the estimates. I am not asking for a breakdown. Can the minister explain what it means?

**Mr. Claxton:** It is the amount we collected for aerial service from other government departments.

**Mr. Fulton:** I am sorry; I have the wrong page. I meant page 172.

**Mr. Claxton:** I beg your pardon. That is explained by reference to the main vote at page 31. The commitment authority is \$438,178,000 as shown in item 202, and that corresponds with the total of \$438,178,000 as shown in the details on page 172. Then there is deducted from that the amount of the current year's commitment authority of \$53,245,696, corresponding to that amount shown on page 31, reducing the amount to the cash appropriation of \$384,932,304, which is the figure shown for item 202.

**Mr. Fulton:** I agree with the minister that the figure \$384 million odd is shown, but I do not understand what the reason is why this \$53 million odd is deducted. In other words I do not understand the explanation given at the bottom of page 172, and there is no explanation of the figure given at page 31. Why is this \$53 million deducted?

**Mr. Claxton:** The amount of the actual cash appropriation for national defence not covered by other items is \$384,932,304. In order to enable the department to make commitments in respect of the current year notwithstanding section 29 of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, provision for this additional amount of \$53,245,696 is made.

**Mr. Harkness:** I remember a vote in some other department, I think resources and development, in connection with roads in the Yukon. Can the minister state whether this