

No member can say that mentioning facts like these is helping the enemy, or that this is an abuse of prerogative. When the hon. member for St. Paul's asked a question not long ago the minister refused to answer him. But that question was a proper one, and it was along the same lines as the return to which I am referring, which I got last year, and a copy of which I gave to every hon. member. Hon. members were afraid to discuss it. There is no reason to be afraid of it. But with regard to the pay for these fellows, I would say that there are civilians throughout the country who work just as hard as possible to help win the war, and to pay salaries to the soldiers. They object strenuously to paying allowances to men who are disguised in uniform and who do very little work. That is my point. I have not the least objection to pay and allowances, and allowances which will be sufficient for the dependents, with respect to those who are training in camps in Canada, and who look after the defence of this country, or with respect to those who are overseas. I think it is our duty to look after our soldiers and officers. But I have the utmost objection to pay and allowances to men in uniform who are doing office work. That is my point, and I would ask the minister to answer it. But before doing so, I would remind him that I made criticism of his predecessor, the present Minister of Pensions and National Health, when, some years ago, there was an increase of \$500 for the judge advocate general. I think it was not justified. I also have the press clipping of October, 1940, where a similar matter was mentioned. This is a dispatch from Ottawa:

The Minister of National Defence announces that Acting Major-General P. J. Montague, C.M.G., D.S.O., M.C., V.D., is transferred from the position of assistant to the adjutant-general at general headquarters of the Canadian army in England to that of superior combatant officer and assistant to the judge advocate general at the same general headquarters. This appointment takes effect from July 6, 1940.

Is it because of the transfer of that gentleman to the branch of the judge advocate general that the present judge advocate was appointed brigadier? I would like to know that, and I ask the minister kindly to give me an answer to it.

Mr. RALSTON: The answer is no, that the judge advocate general was appointed brigadier long before the appointment of General Montague as judge advocate general overseas.

I am not going to take many minutes, I assure the committee, to answer the attack my hon. friend has made. I just wish to read the expressions he has used with regard

to these officers at headquarters: "fighting the good fight for Canada at headquarters"; that they had "won their spurs on the field of Ottawa".

Mr. POULIOT: I did not mention the field.

Mr. RALSTON: And that they were "disguised in uniform". These are the epithets and descriptions—

Mr. POULIOT: Designations.

Mr. RALSTON: —which my hon. friend—which the hon. member used, in connection with these men at Ottawa. I say to my hon. friend—to the hon. member—that what is set out opposite the names of these officers is absolutely correct. Every one of them who is physically fit is liable to and available for service at any time he is directed to serve overseas. I know of no exceptions. I say this advisedly, that I do not know of any man at national defence headquarters who is liable to and physically fit for service overseas who would not like, if he could be spared, to be serving overseas. That has been evidenced in a great many cases, where we have had the greatest difficulty in persuading men to stay here.

I say to the hon. member that evidently he seeks to turn entirely upside down the whole operation, not only of the army but of the air force and the navy, and of the military organization generally throughout the world. His test is to be that a man must carry a rifle or else he cannot wear a uniform. These men who are serving at national defence headquarters, many of whom are veterans of the last war, are men who could serve as combatant officers if they got the chance. But they are men who are needed—some of them are needed to make returns such as the hon. member held in his hand this afternoon. They are needed to make returns to this house, and to keep the records which are required in order to supply the hon. member with information which he may use in an attack against them. This gentleman, the hon. member for Témiscouata, has probably used up as much time at national defence headquarters by way of requiring returns as any other two hon. members in the house. But we have supplied those returns as fast as we could. It requires officers, men who understand these things, and who have some connection with the administration, to bring down such returns.

If the hon. member knew anything about the organization of the army he would know that you have to have men to provide accommodation as well as men to provide