

As to the attitude of the Minister of Justice, I cannot go further than to say that his attitude is to apply the regulations as they exist and as they will exist from time to time. My duty, I take it, is to apply these regulations and not to remake them. If they are to be remade, they will be remade by his excellency in council, after the best consideration in the power of all the members of the government has been given to the recommendations which we hope to receive from the committee. When the policy has been determined I think I may have the privilege of stating it to the house on an occasion when that policy will be debatable. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I am closing this debate and that when I sit down you will put the question. I do not think it would be proper for me therefore to attempt to make any statement now that would not be open to discussion by the house, but when the policy has been formulated I hope to have the opportunity, as I said, of announcing it to the house on an occasion when it will be the subject of debate.

Motion agreed to.

"THE NEW CANADIAN"

INQUIRY AS TO VANCOUVER NEWSPAPER PUBLISHED
IN JAPANESE AND ENGLISH

On the orders of the day:

Mr. THOMAS REID (New Westminster): I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether it is true that a paper is being published in Vancouver under the name of *The New Canadian*, and published in Japanese and in English, and whether any steps are being taken to check up on it?

Hon. N. A. McLARTY (Secretary of State): Will my hon. friend allow me to treat his question as a notice? I have not the information available at the moment, but I shall be glad to obtain it and give an answer very soon.

WAR APPROPRIATION BILL

PROVISION FOR GRANTING TO HIS MAJESTY AID
FOR NATIONAL DEFENCE AND SECURITY

The house resumed from Friday, May 1, consideration in committee of a resolution to provide sums not exceeding \$2,000,000,000 for the year ending March 31, 1943, for granting to his majesty aid for national defence and security—Mr. Ilsley—Mr. Vien in the chair.

Mr. MacNICOL: Yesterday I was in the station at London, Ontario, when a soldier came in who had received a wire from his home in Halifax that his mother or father—

I forget which—had died. He purchased a ticket from London to Halifax, and I observed he had to pay for it \$36.60, as I remember. I asked the young man, "Do you have to pay your own way back to Halifax?" He said, "Yes, I do." In circumstances like that where a Halifax soldier is sent to train far away from home, as far as London in the province of Ontario, surely to goodness there must be some regulation whereby he would not have to pay \$36.60 out of the small monthly sum a private receives to return home to Halifax on the decease of one of his parents. Is there no regulation covering such a case?

Mr. RALSTON: He would pay one-way fare for the return ticket.

Mr. MacNICOL: I know he paid \$36.60. I do not know whether that was return fare or not.

Mr. RALSTON: When they are on leave, they pay one-way fare. There is also a special regulation which provides for payment of one-third of the one-way fare.

Mr. MacNICOL: But there were special circumstances in this case. He was training so far away from home. He might just as well have been training in Nova Scotia as coming all the way to Ontario to be trained. But that appears to be the system all across Canada. Surely under those special circumstances, where the soldier had to return home because of the death of one of his parents, there should be some assistance granted to help him get back home, a free trip or some minimum fare so that he would not have to pay such a large amount as \$36.60.

Mr. RALSTON: The big fare to which my hon. friend refers was on account of the distance. The regulation is that all soldiers on leave get at least one-way fare; that is, they do not have to pay their return fare.

Mr. GLADSTONE: I should like to read a letter appearing in the Guelph *Daily Mercury* of Thursday, April 30, 1942. This letter is from a definite identified unit in England, but the soldiers' names are not given. The letter reads:

Editor Guelph *Daily Mercury*,
Sir:

We, the men of the 16-43rd Battery of Guelph, have been reading in an issue of the *Mercury*, which we were glad to receive, a little late, but better late than never, that the present soldiers of 40-day fame, are being dressed up like Little Lord Fauntleroy's, in a dress uniform, somewhat like that worn by our officers, while we poor chaps find it hard to even get a second pair of issue pants to our battle-dress.