

approve of these things any more than the minister does. The trouble that is caused by the enforcement of this particular rule may not be the fault of the officers, but it is certainly something that should be looked into. It is nothing but charity, the way this money is handed out; and, as I say, some get it and others do not. It has given rise to suffering at home. I might mention one letter in particular I have from a father of a soldier—I will send the letter to the department. This gentleman states in his letter that his soldier boy overseas is getting a dirty deal after having gone through all his training and having passed his tests satisfactorily. He was paid the usual trade money but now on arrival overseas he has had his trade pay stopped and the boys have had to refund all the trade pay they have received. He states that it is very hard on them.

This may not be in the minister's department but it comes under the army and something should be done about it. I regret that apparently the minister has to bear the brunt of all these complaints but it is imperative that someone should rectify these things. Let us revise the rules. Are these men entitled to \$1.50 or \$2 a day as a matter of right, or must there be some means test applicable to soldiers overseas? You do not apply any means test to the gentlemen on the various boards you have in the country. Here is a gentleman, a former university teacher, who is regulating beef, and all he knows about beef is what he himself consumes of it. Beefing the public is all he knows about beef, yet he is in control of it. I refer to this matter simply by way of illustration. The men see various comparisons being made and they become dissatisfied. I realize, of course, that we are faced with a heavy debt and all that, but nothing has been done to bring about some equilibrium between these inequalities we have to-day which have existed since September 11, 1939.

I suggest that the lower paid men ought to be marked up. This is being done in the civil service all the time. The Minister of Finance has referred on several occasions to these inequalities as to lower paid men in the civil service. Are not soldiers as much worthy of this as citizens also? Last session and the session before he was not sympathetic at all to the suggestion that the soldier's allowance should be marked up. This is what they are doing in Washington; why cannot we for once copy Washington? We seem to be Washington-minded in most other things, and this is one instance in which we could be Washington-minded to advantage. In fact, it seems to

[Mr. Church.]

me that Washington is becoming the Ottawa of the south. Let us follow Washington in the matter of soldiers' rates of pay.

The minister said the other day that he would make a statement as to the recent trouble at Sussex camp. No doubt he has not had time to do so, other than the return he made. I hope he will make a statement in the future with regard to the trouble at the Sussex camp and inform the house whether any deductions have been made in consequence of the disturbance there. I understand that those boys have arrived in England and that certain deductions have been made. There was an article in the newspapers last night from the *Toronto Star* to the effect that a whole regiment had been penalized at Sussex. As to the pay, it simply means on the whole that the soldier fighting for his country is paid one way while civilians and others at home are treated differently. The rates of pay are inconsistent. Talk about working in war plants and in other industries at home and on farms; there is nothing to compare to the lot of the man who is removed from his family and sent overseas, or who has to carry on in some of the camps in this country. I appeal to the government to raise the rates of pay for the lower paid men, to give them better treatment, do away with fines and penalties, and abolish the absurd rule whereby we seem to be fulfilling the prophecy that to him that hath shall be given, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

Mr. ADAMSON: I mentioned the other night a matter with regard to national service life insurance. I did not have the figures at the time with regard to the American army, but I have them now and I should like to give them to the committee. This is a matter of great importance and I think the minister should have these figures. May I read a short passage or two from "The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science" for May, 1943, with regard to national service insurance:

Opportunity Afforded by National Service Life Insurance

The opportunity afforded to persons in the active service in time of war, and particularly to those with family responsibilities, to purchase up to a maximum of \$10,000 of National Service Life Insurance at less than peace-time rates is so wonderfully attractive that all should avail themselves of it to the utmost of their financial ability. The premium rates are low: the cost for \$10,000 of five-year level premium term insurance for a person at age 25 is \$6.70 per month; at age 30 it is \$7.10 per month; at age 45 it is \$9.90 per month. With present pay