

*War Appropriation—Army*

here the Canadian army routine order No. 3035, which I am advised is in exact terms the order for the air force and the navy, changing the names and ranks in order to suit the particular service which may be referred to. The rule is:

Army personnel below the rank of sergeant, if required to spend two (2) consecutive nights or more on a continuous journey, may be provided with a berth in a tourist car, if available.

This means that a man coming the first night from Halifax to Montreal would not be provided with a berth, and it applies I am told, to the air force just as to the army and the navy. If there are two nights of travel, then as a matter of fact the man leaving Halifax or Sydney gets tourist accommodation on both nights, and if the class of accommodation provided is not available, then he gets the next higher class if that is. The joker in the thing, if there is one, is that this accommodation often is not available; I think that is the real difficulty. I do not think there is any trouble about the regulations.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Weyburn): Is there not this further difficulty, that very often airmen are moved in small groups of probably three or four, being posted somewhere, while soldiers are moved as a unit or company?

Mr. RALSTON: There should not be any difference under the regulations:

Army personnel below the rank of sergeant, if required to spend two (2) consecutive nights or more on a continuous journey, may be provided with a berth in a tourist car, if available.

This still deals with privates, lance corporals and corporals.

Army personnel below the rank of sergeant proceeding on a special duty which requires them to report for duty immediately on arrival at destination, if travelling overnight, may be provided with a tourist berth. If a tourist car is not operated, first-class transportation and standard berth may be provided.

I am informed that this would apply to a motor or tractor driver, for instance, going to meet a convoy at some particular spot. He should be fresh in the morning, so that he is given a tourist berth. The change that was made, the last nail that was driven in order to make these regulations uniform, I think was regulation 3C which I have just read providing that sergeants are to be given a tourist berth when the journey involves night travel. If tourist accommodation is not available, first class transportation in a standard berth may be provided. There was a difference between the air force, the army

[Mr. Ralston.]

and the navy in that respect. Up to that time army sergeants were given the same accommodation as other ranks. As I remember it, that particular item was changed several months ago. This order is actually dated March of this year, but the changes that were made in the order, which made it necessary to react it in March, were changes with regard to officers.

I must now say a word with regard to meal tickets. I cannot understand the situation to which my hon. friend refers, if the regulations are as they tell me. It would appear to be a case of bad administration if the hon. member found five men travelling from Petawawa to Halifax, as I understood him to say, having nothing to eat and no means of getting it. I am told that when the warrant for the railway transportation is issued at Petawawa, it includes the meals; and the ticket agent gives the man not only the railway ticket but also tickets for meals. If the orderly room sends down for the tickets, it gets the railway ticket and the meal tickets as well, and gives them to the men. I am told further that if men are travelling and for some reason or another have not been given meal tickets, they are entitled to put in charges for their expenses on the train. The answer to that may be that they may have no money to buy meals with; that may have been the situation with these boys. I am told, however, that without exception the meal ticket is issuable east of Ottawa as well as west of Ottawa. I should like very much if my hon. friend would give me that case, because we would like to run it down. Perhaps the hon. member can tell me the train he was on.

Mr. GILLIS: These boys are now overseas.

Mr. RALSTON: Would the hon. member tell me the name of one of the boys?

Mr. GILLIS: Yes, I will.

Mr. GRAYDON: Why is a differentiation made as between one night and two nights? It seems to me that if we are to do the right thing by these boys, we ought to provide them with some reasonable kind of accommodation for sleeping, even if they are on the train for only one night. I imagine the minister and members of the house who ride on trains often find it difficult enough to obtain decent accommodation. Surely we should not ask these men to travel even for one night without proper accommodation. I cannot see the reason for making any difference between one night and two nights. The travel time is longer, but the principle is the same, and I do not think we should have that difference.