

War Appropriation—Army

With regard to the other case, my hon. friend is right in calling attention to subsection 3 which states in precise terms that the provisions with regard to assigned pay shall be fully explained. One would have thought that they would be explained, and the man had a perfect right to have them explained to him, not only as to the effect of the assignment to the father but as to the effect of the assignment to the daughter as well. I presume that case has been brought to the attention of the department.

Mr. KNOWLES: It has been brought to the attention of the dependents' allowance board, yes; but the board refuses to make the dependent's allowance to the daughter retroactive.

Mr. RALSTON: The whole basis of the application to make it retroactive is that the provisions of the dependent's allowance regulations were not explained to the man in accordance with the requirements of subsection 3, and that is a question of fact which will have to be looked into.

Mr. KNOWLES: Is the minister asking me whether I brought to the attention of his department the negligence to which I have referred?

Mr. RALSTON: Yes.

Mr. KNOWLES: I did not.

Mr. RALSTON: That is the point at issue in reference to the question of making it retroactive.

Mr. KNOWLES: Would the minister like to have me bring it to the attention of his department?

Mr. RALSTON: No; we have made a note of it; but perhaps my hon. friend will give us the name.

Mr. KNOWLES: I will send it.

Mr. HANSELL: With regard to pay and allowances of those men who are discharged from the forces and who have not yet been able to get employment, if the minister has answered the question I am about to ask I will not press it, but I understand that this particular phase has not been discussed. According to order in council P.C. 2341—

Mr. RALSTON: Is that the order in council providing for reemployment?

Mr. HANSELL: It is the order in council increasing the allowances. I quote:

Whereas the rates or out-of-work benefits and grants under the said order are deemed inadequate—

[Mr. Ralston.]

I am pleased that the government have decided that \$9 a week is inadequate.

—it is deemed advisable that the sum be increased to \$10.20.

I must say I admire them for opening their hearts to such an extent that they have increased it a couple of dollars a week.

Mr. RALSTON: May I just call attention to this. I know that this debate, particularly to-night, has pretty well gone around the circle. Could my hon. friend bring that in under some other item where it would be more appropriate? I think he is discussing the case of a man not in the army and in respect of whom payments are made by the Department of Pensions and National Health.

Mr. HANSELL: I think the minister is correct. This man is not fighting; he is coming home, and he is out of work.

Mr. RALSTON: If he is in the army he gets more than \$10.20.

Mr. HANSELL: This fellow cannot be in the army because he gets only \$10.20. I am willing to discuss the matter under an item in the Department of Pensions and National Health, if I can be assured that there is an item there under which I can discuss it.

Mr. RALSTON: Will my hon. friend accept my absolute assurance as a member of the government that there will be an opportunity to discuss it?

Mr. HANSELL: Thank you.

Mr. RALSTON: Under the estimates of the Department of Pensions and National Health.

Mr. GREEN: This vote for pay and allowances amounts to slightly under \$540,000,000. I should like to find out from the minister what the department figures each man costs per annum and also whether or not there is a difference between the case of a man who is overseas and the case of a man who is serving in Canada. If one takes the total number of men in the army, which the minister the other day said was 250,000 in Canada and 190,000 overseas, one gets a total of 440,000, and dividing that into this vote we get a cost per man of approximately \$1,225. That may not be a fair way of arriving at this cost, and I wonder whether the minister can give us the figures. I should like to ask one or two more questions after I get the answer.

Mr. RALSTON: I do not think it has been calculated in that way. My hon. friend is right on a rough calculation; that is what it comes to. It is calculated on the basis of \$382,000,000 for all ranks and for trades pay and uniform allowance; then dependents'