

Supply—National Defence

merely a nominal amount, and authorized funds being spent have already been voted for another purpose. As the minister has just indicated, he will be prepared to bring forward a supplementary estimate if that is necessary. He has given us an indication that the total amount to be spent on this contribution to the United Nations emergency force will be in the nature of some \$5 million. That would appear to be a reasonable amount for the work which is being undertaken.

I should like the minister to tell us something of the accommodation which these troops are likely to have. We have had the experience of finding that providing accommodation in Europe for our Canadian forces has run into very large sums of money. There was a term coined for it, I think "infrastructure". I do not know whether that is to be applied to the type of expenditures which are to be made for the housekeeping of troops in the Suez. No doubt that will be explained in further detail, but we should like to know something about the accommodation that is to be provided.

There is one further question I should like to ask. Would the minister clear up the point? Suppose the United Nations emergency force is ordered to take part in operations other than those to which the Secretary of State for External Affairs referred this morning. Does the government consider it has authority to send those troops to some other theatre in the Middle East, or would it require additional grants of money or official permission from parliament in order to do that? I understand that we are sending these troops as part of the United Nations emergency force, purely and solely for employment in Egypt and the Suez district.

Mr. Jones: I do not intend to take very long, but I think there is one important matter that has cropped up in the last hour or so. Listening to the hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich pleading for the young men who have joined the forces, probably married young men with families or at least some dependents, I was led to wonder whether or not they were protected. That is the question I wish to bring to the attention of the minister right now. In answer to a question by the hon. member for Winnipeg North this morning, he said that the conditions of service for those going to Egypt are similar to the conditions of service for those who are now in Germany. In other words there is no change in the responsibility of the government for servicemen in Germany or in Egypt.

I have a serious complaint to make, because I find that the Department of National

Defence regards a young man who has not been in the service for 10 years as no responsibility of theirs. If he has only three or four years of service he is not covered for death or accident outside of his duties. The minister knows of the case I have in mind. I have been trying to do something for three years for a widow and two children. This soldier happened to be killed in Germany; and because he was off duty at the time he was killed, up to date they have not received any recognition from either Germany or this government. If we are going to ask young men with responsibilities to go overseas to do our work in Egypt where conditions may be—and I can quite believe it—much tougher than they are in West Germany, we should see that they are adequately protected.

As I pointed out, I believe these men are not adequately protected unless they have been in the service for 10 years, and very few men who have been in the service for 10 years will be going to Egypt. Therefore I suggest that those soldiers with less than 10 years' service who are going overseas should have an insurance policy taken out immediately on their lives covering death, accident, disability or anything else. I am not going to suggest the value of the policy, but it should be at least \$10,000 or \$20,000; otherwise those men who are going overseas to do our work are going over there under false pretenses. They are not covered or protected. The answer given by the minister does not fill the bill, because I can prove that it did not fill the bill in the last three years since to my mind it failed to carry out Canada's obligations to the men who went to Germany.

I hold in my hand a resolution of a Canadian Legion branch in British Columbia, which passed it as the result of bitter and disillusioning experience already with cases in Germany to which I referred. This resolution was passed by the Kelowna branch of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League on November 20 of this year. The resolution reads:

Be it resolved that this branch of the Canadian Legion of the British Empire Service League go on record in asking legislation be immediately implemented to the effect that all service personnel who are sent for duty in the Middle East be insured by the government of Canada, so that in the case of death by accident or the loss of limbs or any injury, whether suffered by the result of enemy action, or civilian carelessness, their families may be supplemented by the awarding of sufficient pension to allow the wife, sons and/or daughters to live comfortably regardless of length of service.

I bring that to the attention of the minister for his consideration. It is the least we can do when we ask these men to go out to Egypt to undertake what is probably a very unpleasant duty, but at our behest and it is in our interest. The least we can do is