

Canadian Forces Act

that huge building without any holdup or delay. In there they could have a shower, free haircuts, and then have clean underwear, clean shirts and clean shoes. Pressing machines were set up, and their suits were pressed so that when they had their showers they were turned out as smart soldiers.

None of this was done by the auxiliary services. It was all done by the Canadian army, under control of army headquarters. All the troops who worked there—and there were hundreds of them—in connection with supplying these services were all fighting troops. Most of the men were engineers.

When hon. members suggest that this was done by the auxiliary services, my answer is that it is not so.

Mr. Green: We did not say that at all.

Mr. Hosking: While we were stationed in England we were well serviced by these auxiliary services. But when it comes down to doing the big job that has to be done when the troops are fighting, it becomes a military matter. I wish to compliment the department on the stand it has taken in this connection, and I believe that if the experience of the last war is used, the same procedure will be taken at the present time.

Mr. Green: Does the hon. member think there should not be auxiliary services with the troops at the present time?

Mr. Martin: He did not say that.

Mr. Hosking: I am certain that the government that did such a splendid job at Brussels, Antwerp and Paris, under the conditions they had in the last war, is doing today exactly the same fine job, and under the same procedure in Korea.

Mr. Churchill: There has been no suggestion from hon. members in this party that auxiliary services should supply the personnel, and other requirements, for army rest camps such as those to which the hon. member was referring. The army rest camps which were set up at Brussels and Antwerp were entirely different. I have been referring this afternoon to the use of the auxiliary service officer at the battalion or regimental level who goes with the regiment or battalion into the forward areas, where army rest camps are obviously quite out of the question. It is that type of auxiliary service assistance that I think is desirable, and can best be rendered by those who are attached to the auxiliary services.

Mr. Fulton: Mr. Chairman, there is a closely related subject to which I would direct the attention of the committee. Yesterday I asked the minister a question with respect to the reception of troops returning from Korea. I was greatly delighted to see

in today's press an account of the reception accorded to 202 men who were returning.

As I said at the outset, I am delighted—and I do not wish to qualify that in any way—with what has been done. But I wish to impress upon the parliamentary assistant and the department that if that can be done, as indeed it was done, for a large body of men, I suggest it is equally important to do it for a small body of men, perhaps only one or two or half a dozen, who are coming through in small groups, and who are on their way back to take courses, as was suggested by the minister, or for some other reason. I believe it is correct to say, although regrettable, that these men in small groups are getting the feeling that no one is particularly interested in their return.

While, as I said, I do not wish to qualify my approval of the reception accorded the larger groups, and in particular the 202 men who returned yesterday, I hope the same enterprise and energy can be put into the preparation of receptions for smaller groups who are coming back.

Section agreed to.

Sections 2 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

On section 6—"Defence service" and "defence service contributor" defined.

Mr. Knight: Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask for some information with respect to this section. Subsection 1 states, in part:

(b) "defence service contributor" means a person who satisfies all of the following conditions . . .

(ii) he was a contributor under the Defence Services Pension Act on or subsequent to the first day of July, nineteen hundred and fifty-one, and

(iii) he was retired from the regular forces to enable him to accept an appointment under the National Defence Act or to the staff of the Department of National Defence.

It seems to me there is a discrepancy here. Is there any difference in the percentage rate of contribution made by one who resigned from the services in 1945 and joined the civil service some years later, and those who will now, at the time of the coming into force of this measure, leave the Department of National Defence and go into the civil service? My information is that the man who resigned in 1946 from the Royal Canadian Air Force, and then accepted an appointment in the civil service, uses his military service in respect of the civil service pension plan, and contributes 12 per cent of the initial starting salary. Is that correct?

Mr. Campney: This is a very limited section. It does not apply to people who have been in the services and who subsequently join the civil service, except when they

[Mr. Hosking.]