

Supply—National Defence

amount to some \$1,795,000; at Dartmouth, for the naval air station, \$2,660,000; at Cornwallis \$1,345,000; at Sydney, Nova Scotia, \$575,000. There are other smaller expenditures, but at St. John's Newfoundland there is an expenditure of \$270,000; on the west coast there is an expenditure of \$1,985,000 at Esquimalt, and for the various naval radio stations the sum of \$330,000.

Mr. Hellyer: I am sorry that inadvertently we let item 217 pass without asking about aircraft, and I wonder if the minister would be willing to give us some information as to the type of aircraft doing service in the navy, what the proposed expenditure for the fiscal year is and, finally, what naval air reserve squadrons are still operating, if any.

Mr. Pearkes: The two main types of aircraft are the Banshees and Trackers. Both of these are aircraft which operate from the carrier *Bonaventure*, but in the case of the Tracker, it does operate from the shore. The Banshees are essentially fighter aircraft with the role of driving off hostile aircraft which might be attacking our own aircraft or even the carrier itself. The Trackers are reconnaissance aircraft to assist the Argus in locating hostile craft. We also have for intercommunication purposes a limited number of helicopters which can be used for transporting personnel from one ship to another. They are capable of landing on our destroyers. I have myself landed on one of the destroyer escorts from a helicopter. They are also invaluable in reconnaissance and anti-submarine work.

Mr. Hellyer: I did not gather which planes are still being delivered or will be delivered during the coming year.

Mr. Pearkes: The delivery of Trackers has not yet been completed and if I remember accurately we have some 100 of these to be delivered; I am sorry that would be the total, with what we have to date. And in this year's estimates it is shown that \$21,570,000 is provided for the Tracker aircraft.

Mr. Hellyer: I wonder if the minister could tell us what the advertising budget was, or would he prefer to deal with it first once for the three services?

Mr. Pearkes: They are broken down between the services. Last year we reduced the amount of advertising by one-third. That advertising is used for recruiting purposes.

Mr. Hellyer: Can the minister give us the expenditure last year on advertisements placed in other than English or French language papers?

Mr. Pearkes: The hon. member means foreign languages—ethnic group languages—is that the term? I do not think I have that

information with me. We do engage in a certain amount of advertising in the languages which are used by people who have not been in this country very long and who might be interested. Advertisements are placed in the different papers by agencies with the general principle of getting the greatest value for the amount of money expended.

Mr. Hellyer: Does that apply to the other services, too?

Mr. Pearkes: That applies to all the services. I believe all the services carry on an advertising program to a limited extent, and some of it is done on a tri-service basis in the papers of the ethnic groups.

Mr. Pearson: There is an amount in this item of \$29 million for the procurement of ships. How much of it is in terms of ships themselves? What ships are involved?

Mr. Pearkes: With respect to destroyer escorts, in the original program of 14 ships there is still \$8 million provided in this year's estimates for that: in the destroyer escorts' new program, that is the repeat *Restigouche*, the first of which was laid down in Vickers yards early this year, and the second of which is to be laid down this month, there is the sum of \$15 million. That embraces all the preliminary work, plan making and that sort of thing, for those ships. There is \$2 million for the tanker to which I have referred already. There is \$1 million for mechanical equipment for existing ships and for miscellaneous which includes drawings, gear testings, and so forth, \$3,280,000.

Mr. Pearson: The minister mentioned a figure of \$2 million for a tanker which was, of course, included in his annual report. I gather the purpose of this expenditure is to construct a tanker so that our anti-submarine vessels can remain for a longer time at sea; but since our naval strength in the Atlantic is so closely integrated with that of the United States under NATO command, would it not have been possible to accomplish the same purpose by the utilization of United States tanker strength—and there must be a very considerable amount of that—which could have been made available to Canadian naval vessels without going to the expense of building a naval tanker of our own at a cost of \$2 million.

Mr. Pearkes: Under the general nature of the plans these ships on the Atlantic, as the hon. gentleman knows, come under the operational command of SACLANT in the event of hostilities breaking out. First, each nation provides its own logistic support. It is quite possible, in the event of hostilities breaking out, there might be a pooling of the support.