

Canadian Forces Act

there is a mortgage. After he is in the service the wife finds that this \$126 does not replace her husband's earnings. She is not able to meet the mortgage payments and maintain the children. Then there is a controversy started by mail in an endeavour to get him out of the service. In some cases he is let out, but in most cases he is not. When a man is let out we have wasted the money in outfitting and training him and transporting him across the country. Some revision is necessary. If married men are accepted, then the wife should be enabled to maintain the same standard for her family as the husband provided before he enlisted.

There is another angle to this question of married men in the service. By joining the army today many married men can get completely clear of their responsibilities to their families. I have brought to the attention of the department cases in which married men have joined the army. A couple of months later the wife finds she is getting no allowance at all. The man has to make an assignment and he will not do so, so the wife is left at the mercy of the municipality. I have ironed this out so far as I could with the department. I asked the department to parade that man and ascertain whether or not he should be supporting his family. The department takes the view that they have no authority to do that. They say that you must get a court order. If this woman is living on Cape Breton Island or in Vancouver, she has to go to a magistrate and make application under a certain section of the Criminal Code in order to get a court order. The wife must produce her husband in court, and if he happens to be up in Camp Borden it means that the municipality has to send police officers up there to get him. The municipality is not going to do that, and the defence department take the position they have no responsibility in the matter. In the meantime, the man is in the service and his family is on the outside starving. That is not an ideal situation, and I think the department should do something about it. If married men are to be taken in, then their families should be properly looked after. Otherwise, married men should not be taken into the service. I do not see how we can justify enabling a man to get clear of his responsibility to his family by going into the service. I believe those two points should be corrected.

I have said two or three times, but I am going to repeat it, that it is not fair that a clothing allowance is not granted to men who are leaving the service after having served in Korea. After the last war a man received 30 days' pay, and 30 days to look around and find out what he was going to do. Upon going into the service most men have a suit,

[Mr. Gillis.]

perhaps two. During the period in service the suit is either moth-eaten or out of date. He is given a uniform to go out in, but he is not going to wear that around very long before he becomes conspicuous in the neighbourhood. I do not think it is asking too much to provide at least a clothing allowance and 30 days' pay to the man who has seen combat service. If we are going to start revising many of these acts, I think those points should be remembered.

I strongly urge the minister to take a look at the superannuation arrangements that are in effect now. Apparently they are to be changed. He should consider also the position of a man serving 10 or 15 years in the service, who has seen combat service, and who dies while in service but whose death the medical officers will not attribute to service, because he has not a big hole shot in him. In the case I mentioned earlier the man had two or three years of combat service; he went through Italy and central Europe, and upon coming back to Canada stayed in the service. I do not think that any medical people could make a dogmatic assertion that in large part that man's death at that age was not due to military service. In that case the benefit of the doubt was not given to the man or his wife and two children. I have talked about this case so much that it has become a phobia with me. I am going to continue to talk about it until somebody does something about it. I appreciate the minister's position. He has the army, the navy and the air force on his hands at the present time. I know that his personnel department are working hard devising new regulations and all that kind of thing. It may just not seem to be particularly important to consider a case like that when you have a billion dollars' worth of equipment to work on. But do not forget that equipment is no good without men; and unless you are going to get men with contented minds, with the assurance that they and their dependents are going to be taken care of, all of our equipment and all of our money is no good.

There are many other things I should like to say.

Mr. Wylie: Say them.

Mr. Gillis: No, I must go to a committee and look after maritime freight rates. I am going to leave these few thoughts with the minister. I hope that I will never again have to say anything about these matters and that they will all be taken care of.

Mr. Fulton: I have just two comments that I should like to make on points of substance and one on a matter of form with respect to the legislation. On the matters of substance, it is perhaps not necessary to enlarge—