

for the armed forces, because I have travelled a great deal on the trains. I have spoken on this question before and have said, and I say now, that it is a wrong principle to distinguish between the branches of the armed forces, especially when social distinctions are made. I recall that not long ago there was a little difficulty in getting recruits for the army, and we went so far as to advertise that we would provide them with walking-out uniforms. A great deal of propaganda was put on at that time to get recruits and to raise the morale, shall I say, of those who were contemplating joining the army. Evidently it was felt by those who were thinking of enlisting in some branch of the armed forces that there were social distinctions and that the army was not as highly thought of as the other two services. That is wrong, and there should be no distinction, social or otherwise, between the different branches of the armed forces, because the soldier has just as an important job to do as the man in the air force and the man in the navy. He is just as important as the other two. I am quite confident that there was a feeling in the armed forces that those in the army were not so good as those in the air force and that, therefore, it was all right for the men in the army to sit up in a day coach when going home on leave, while the other fellows had a sleeper. There is still a great deal of hard feeling in that respect. I have talked to men in the air force and to men in the navy, and they are very much disappointed that this distinction is made. The air force fellows do not think they are a bit better than the men in the army, and they resent the conditions under which the army men have to travel. I am sure that the minister realizes this and probably has done what he could to rectify the situation. It is one that certainly must be rectified.

Mr. McGARRY: When the question of free transportation for the soldiers was brought up in the house last year I expressed very sincerely my opinion that free transportation should be granted to them. I have not changed my opinion in that regard. Indeed, I feel more strongly about it than ever, and I just wish to take a moment to associate myself with the other hon. members who have spoken on behalf of this concession being granted to soldiers. In view of what they are accomplishing in a military way and their splendid contribution to the recent victory loan, I think all hon. members will agree that this is a concession which the men in the army certainly merit.

Mr. GRAYDON: It is a right rather than a concession.

Mr. MacNICOL: A few days ago I came from Montreal on the afternoon train and had the experience of seeing just what treatment is handed out to soldiers on the trains. I did not know that there were such trains running between Montreal and Ottawa. On the train, which consisted of quite a number of coaches, were 200 soldiers, perhaps more. I never before remember having ridden in such cars. I would call them cattle cars. When I went on the platform there was a trainman there—it was not his fault—who said "Ottawa passengers in here." I went in. It was one of these old-fashioned cars with brass fittings on the seats. The seats were back to back. The cars were packed full. That is not the way to treat soldiers, whether they are on their last trip or their first. I got off the train and asked an official on the platform, "Where are our passenger cars?" "Why," he said, "those are the passenger cars." I said, "I would call that a cattle car." I was put out at having to ride in a car like that, and although I had not intended to mention it here, now that the question has been raised, I think it is in order to do so. I wonder where the old second-class cars are; they were infinitely better than those which were used on that Montreal-Ottawa train. Where these cars came from, I do not know. I have never seen cars like that one before. What I particularly objected to was the way in which the seats were placed, back to back. There was no one going through selling chocolates, soft drinks or other refreshments. I do not think such conditions are good enough for soldiers; in my judgment they are entitled to better treatment than we civilians are and as a civilian I very much objected to the train on which I had to ride that day from Montreal.

Some hon. member has spoken about free trips on the soldier's last leave. The hon. member for Broadview has raised this matter here frequently since war broke out. My leader to-day has strongly urged that on the last trip and on furlough such consideration be given to soldiers. I think every hon. member is in accord with having the last trip made a free trip. I have seen soldiers on trains who had not a cent in their pockets. How could they have saved anything out of \$1.30 a day, when one considers all the expenses they are up against? I join my appeal with those of other hon. members, particularly the hon. member for Peel, that the minister consider providing the soldier with free transportation to and from his home when he is on embarkation leave.

Mr. ADAMSON: I merely want to go on record as supporting the proposal of free trans-