

*War Appropriation—Army*

such tremendous production that we can get transport planes for training just at the present time.

Mr. GREEN: Does the minister say it is impossible for Canada to get any transport planes for training troops? We had a big transport plane over Ottawa last week, and the Americans have had them. I submit to the committee that if the defence department wanted to train troops in that way, wanted to get some transport planes for training troops, they could get them; and if we could carry more troops by air, if we had air-borne brigades or divisions, we should probably need far fewer men to defend Canada. I am quite serious about this matter. I do not understand why Canada should not be up to date with regard to the training of troops for transport by air.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not want to be short with my hon. friend, but when he makes a statement like that, that the Department of National Defence, had they wanted to, could have had transport planes and could train air-borne divisions, I only say to him, respectfully, but very firmly, that he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. GREEN: The Minister of Munitions and Supply is here. Between them, do the ministers say that Canada cannot get transport planes for the training of our army?

Mr. RALSTON: I am saying that at the present time Canada is not in a position to demand transport planes, in view of the need for transport planes in active theatres.

Mr. GREEN: Probably if we had had a few paratroops at Dieppe we would not have had such casualties.

Mr. RALSTON: If we had had my hon. friend at Dieppe I have no doubt it would all have gone according to the book.

Mr. GREEN: It could not have been much worse. Have our troops in Great Britain been given an opportunity of being trained in this regard?

Mr. RALSTON: Our troops in Great Britain have taken every opportunity to train in connection with aircraft cooperation and airborne activities in so far as the equipment was available.

Item agreed to.

On item 9—M.T. vehicles: trucks, tractors, trailers, tanks, A.F.Vs. and repair parts.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Is all this equipment delivered and in actual

[Mr. Ralston.]

operation? I am referring to the \$272,000,000 worth. Do I understand that it has all been delivered, none of it being on the sidings in Canada?

Mr. RALSTON: There is certainly some of it, not on the sidings but on the docks in Canada.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I mean, in the packing cases?

Mr. RALSTON: Certainly. There is some on the docks. It is being shipped all the time.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): I do not mean on the docks, but in different places like Belleville, Trenton and so on.

Mr. RALSTON: It will have to be in stores, too, until shipping comes along. We cannot put it all on the docks. It is being delivered as shipping is available and whenever the need arises. It is all ready for use.

Mr. HAZEN: Was all this money spent in Canada last year, and will it all be spent here this year, or was part of it spent outside? If so, how much?

Mr. RALSTON: In connection with some of this equipment, components are purchased in the United States. Some heavy motor transports are purchased in the United States, but the great bulk of it, apart from the money for components, is spent in Canada.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): Some of this equipment has been on the dumps or sidings for two years or more. Is that included in this amount?

Mr. RALSTON: So far as equipment for Canada is concerned—the material that is covered by this item—there is a very small proportion of it that is on the dumps, to use my hon. friend's expression, or the sidings, and such as there is, is awaiting shipment.

Mr. FRASER (Peterborough West): That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. ROSS (Souris): This seems to be \$100,000,000 more than last year's. How is it accounted for?

Mr. RALSTON: It is accounted for in this way. The money was not all spent last year owing to the fact that reserves were not used up, there being no activity, and what is put in this year is to provide reserves and to provide against casualties. The expenditure last year would have been almost the amount shown for this year had there been activity. Since there was no activity, the reserves were not used up and the money was not required, so that only \$270,000,000 was spent.