

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): I agree with that, because the disposal of surplus equipment comes under War Assets Corporation. The goods that were destroyed were destroyed on instructions of War Assets Corporation. While the air force carried out the work, it was on the instructions of War Assets Corporation, and as soon as the matter was brought to my attention I stopped any work of destruction unless representatives of War Assets Corporation were on the spot, so that they could personally supervise it. Although our air force personnel may be called upon to do the manual work, it is under the control of War Assets Corporation.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: I understand, then, from the minister's statement that he did not follow the ordinary procedure of declaring this material surplus, sending it to the war allocations committee, and from there sending it to War Assets Corporation. Apparently his department was acting on instructions from War Assets Corporation prior to the time when the department declared it surplus.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): We had instructions that certain material which had no value was not to be sent to War Assets but to be destroyed on the spot.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: In other words, the minister's department did not declare it surplus—

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): We declared it surplus, but it was not to be sent down but to be disposed of on the spot.

Mr. CASTLEDEN: On November 2 the minister also said that he would give a statement with regard to the cost of establishing radar beams across Canada.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton West): There were other questions asked by the hon. member. He asked what instruments other than signals were destroyed at Penhold. The answer is, none.

Another question was asked, by the hon. member for Red Deer: Was Mr. J. H. Ross, vocational training, advised that Penhold equipment had an educational value? The answer is, not by the R.C.A.F. I do not know whether anyone else advised him.

The second question was this: Was the Calgary representative of War Assets Corporation consulted and did he investigate? The answer is: The R.C.A.F. did not consult War Assets Corporation's Calgary representative. Authority for disposal was obtained from the head office of War Assets Corporation.

[Mr. Johnston.]

The third question was whether Air Commodore Tackaberry specified that there was no ground equipment. The answer is, yes.

A further question was asked by the hon. member for St. Paul's: What steps have been taken to give schools, technical schools, universities, et cetera, surplus scientific equipment belonging to the R.C.A.F.? Crown assets allocation committee advised R.C.A.F. that no equipment was to be given to educational institutions of any kind but must be referred to them for disposal, and that they had made arrangements to handle such requests and arrange for issue at nominal prices.

A second question was: What was the original value of equipment turned over to War Assets Corporation? The answer is, the original value was, as of October 31, \$277,557,000.

The hon. member for Yorkton asked, what sum was spent for permanent signals equipment in 1944 and to date in 1945 and at what places? He also asked, has there been any installation of such equipment since V-E day? The answer to the first question is: During 1944 and early 1945 signals equipment to the value of \$5,427,000 was obtained for installation at ninety-nine locations in Canada, Newfoundland and Labrador. This figure, which excludes lend lease, and contributions in kind by the United Kingdom to the air training plan, may be broken down as follows: aids to navigation, including a number of radio ranges installed by the Department of Transport with R.C.A.F. funds, \$2,735,000; airways traffic control, an international commitment under the recommendations of the permanent joint board on defence, Canada and the United States, \$1,620,000; and point to point and ground to air communication service, \$885,000. The facilities thus provided, in addition to serving British and American aircraft using the ferry routes through Canada, were used by R.C.A.F. operational and training aircraft from the aerodromes and seadromes. In answer to the question: Has there been an installation of such equipment since V-E day, I would say that no new installations have been commenced since V-E day, but a few projects of lasting national or international significance are being carried to completion.

There was one other question of the hon. member for Yorkton. He asked: What is the number of aircraft on hand in the R.C.A.F. (a) training; (b) overseas, and (c) in stored reserve? I have not given the answer in quite that form, but it can be taken from the answer I give. We have in training aircraft in Canada unit establishment, 661. We have in workshop reserve, under repair, 104, and in stored