

that there are many armouries in the towns throughout the province, particularly in the southeastern part, which could be made use of. At Indian Head there is a good building of which more use could be made. Some of these armouries could be used for the training of home guards and veteran guards. Last year they were all taken away from Indian Head where they had quite a good corps in 1940 and in the early part of 1941. I wish the minister would give some attention to this. I believe there are some buildings at Grenfell and Moosomin, and, as I say, there is a good one at Indian Head. Better use could be made of these armouries.

Mr. RALSTON: Is there one at Katopwa?

Mr. PERLEY: Maybe the Minister of Agriculture would look after that. There may be one at Melville. I am pleading for southeastern Saskatchewan, however. I find that there are ten buildings in Regina which the department has rented either in whole or in part. Can the minister give an estimate of what proportion of this item for rentals will be paid in the city of Regina and what has been spent in repairs or in changes in these buildings to meet accommodation? I understand that there have been many changes in the buildings rented. Who pays for that? Does the landlord or the department?

Mr. RALSTON: I cannot give now the amount in this vote for the rental of buildings in Regina. The assistant deputy minister refers me to a return which I presume is the one my hon. friend is dealing with, namely, a return to No. 178 of March 22. That gives a complete list of buildings rented and rentals paid. This is not a very definite answer, but all I can say is that there is included in this item the rental of all these buildings in so far as they are retained by the department. That is the most I can say.

Mr. PERLEY: Can the minister give the cost of repairs?

Mr. RALSTON: The cost of remodelling?

Mr. PERLEY: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I think I could get that for the hon. member.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I have not yet received an answer. Possibly the minister has not the information available as to expenditures for drainage and the like in 1942 and 1943.

Mr. RALSTON: At Debert?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: No, I have not the information available. My officer tells me that no major expenditure has been made for that purpose in 1942-43. By major he would mean anything above \$5,000.

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: I think the minister missed what I had in mind. In the choice of sites for military camps consideration should be given to the securing of sites where the expenditure of amounts for irrigation and drainage totalling \$230,000 would not be necessary. That is the point I am endeavouring to make. In 1940, when I was there, conditions were such as to be most discouraging to the men established in that camp. Who makes the choice of sites? Is the final determination that of the minister? What has been the total expenditure, to date on Debert camp? I refer to expenditures for the purchase of land, the installation of facilities, and the like.

Then as to another matter, which is possibly the antithesis of drainage, namely the securing of water for the various camps, if my recollection is correct, in 1940 and 1941 the services of a company with office in London, Ontario, known as the International Water Supply company, were utilized for the purpose of ascertaining information in connection with and securing supplies of water.

Mr. RALSTON: At Debert?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: At all the camps across Canada. How much was disbursed to that company during each of the years 1940, 1941 and 1942?

Mr. RALSTON: One further word about Debert camp: my hon. friend says we should never have selected a site in connection with which \$230,000 would have to be spent for drainage. I am quite satisfied that that figure includes expenditures for sewage and the other services necessary in a camp of that kind. I am satisfied it does not apply only to surface drainage, as perhaps would be indicated by my hon. friend's remarks. Even if \$230,000 did have to be spent for drainage in a camp of that size, if it had all the other features about which I have spoken, and they could not be obtained elsewhere, there would be ample justification in making the expenditure where such facilities can be obtained.

Water is one commodity in point. The Debert camp is placed where we can get water, and I can assure the committee that it is not everywhere that one can find water in sufficient quantities to serve 12,000 to 15,000 men, in a camp area as small as that at Debert.