

War Appropriation

there would have been no accident. If the man who ran out had been of some substance she would have had recourse against him, but under the circumstances she has none, and the crown will not give her a chance to sue. It seems to me there should be some way by which this poor woman, as well as the other people who were injured, could be compensated. The parade took place there, and it seems to me that there is some liability. I should like to know what the minister has to say.

Mr. RALSTON: I appreciate the hon. member's consideration. He has not even brought the case to my personal attention; evidently he has exhausted departmental procedure in connection with it.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): Yes.

Mr. RALSTON: I should like to toy with the legal end of it, but I know that that is not the important thing. My hon. friend suggested that if the parade had not taken place there would not have been an accident and therefore the crown is liable.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): No, I did not suggest that the crown was liable.

Mr. RALSTON: I thought that my hon. friend was suggesting it. If I remember my law, it is not, as I understand it, the *causa sine qua non* but the *causa causans* which decides whether or not the defence is liable; and the parade was not the cause of the accident—not the proximate cause of the accident—in that sense.

My hon. friend suggests that in a civil case there would have been a trial and the lady would have got something. I can say to him, if this will do him any good and do the lady any good—for the crown does not want to avoid any liability—that I shall certainly take the matter up with my colleague the Minister of Justice and ascertain if it is not possible to grant her a fiat so that she may have her day in court and an opportunity just as she would have in a civil case. That may be of some help. The only alternative is payment *ex gratia*. Invitations of that kind in my department are pretty frequent, and I have to have some general rule. I do not believe that, on the statement of the case which is made by my hon. friend, it can possibly be considered on that ground. However, I assume that my hon. friend will send me the name of the person—probably my secretary has it now—and I shall look into the case to see if anything more can be done.

[Mr. Douglas G. Ross.]

Mr. CHURCH: The matter which has been mentioned this afternoon of hospitalization and the care of the soldier and his dependents, and also the dependency money, has been before the house since the fall of 1939. I then raised this question, which is still on the order paper and under the rule of anticipation has never been dealt with, and there is a private bill about this and other matters.

The question of hospitalization is a most important one, and the matters which have been raised here are directly related to the subject matter of the resolution which I brought in immediately after the war started, namely a proper system of national insurance of the soldier and his dependents. The policy which I proposed, and which the Minister of Finance refused last year and the year before to adopt, was an insurance policy like the one they have at Washington—I had the document here and read it to the house—to take care of hospitalization, sickness, unemployment for two years after the war, and rehabilitation of the soldier and his family.

What have we now? We have this work centred very largely in the municipalities. Large numbers of men have enlisted, and what provision are we making for them in these respects? Anything that is not in the draft estimates has to be covered by the resolution covering the \$2,000,000,000. It is an involved resolution, because it covers hundreds of items and a multitude of sins and errors which have been committed since the war began.

The subject of hospitalization involves soldiers who, having enlisted and trained for three months, may go overseas and then be sent home. Who looks after them? Judging from the cases which have been brought to my attention, I understand they have to go from one authority to another, with the result that they cannot pay their rent; sometimes they cannot get the money due them, and the bailiff puts them out. I know many cases of suffering under these circumstances. The province cuts them off relief and will give them no further help. The result, as I see it Toronto, which has one of the finest health departments on the continent, is that the city is forced to look after some of these men or let them go out on the streets and shift for themselves. I admit that the present Minister of National Defence has made a great improvement.

The other matter to which I wish to refer is that in my opinion we have the wrong system of considering the question at present before us. It is unfair to require a minister