

skirts of the problem. It does not include that vast army of men who, when war broke out, were unemployed and enlisted in the armed services. Again, it does not include all those who were employed; it covers only those who were employed on September 9, 1939, in other than a temporary position. In other words, the man who was employed on September 9, 1939, does not come under this legislation at all unless he was then permanently employed. Again, it does not include all those who were unemployed on September 9, 1939, but secured employment after that date. It covers only those who were employed after that date for at least six months in other than a temporary position. Therefore, as far as the bill before us goes, it pertains to only one group of the men—those who had jobs that were permanent jobs.

It does not cover men who had temporary jobs or those hired from week to week or month to month. It is well to know that of the men who have returned from overseas since the outbreak of this war, as unfit for service, numbering 3,932, only 1,109 had been pensioned, and it would be of interest if the minister could tell us how many of those men who have come back from overseas, who are not now in the army in Canada, and who are not now receiving pensions, are unemployed.

I do not very often pay compliments, but in fairness to the Minister of Pensions and National Health (Mr. Mackenzie) I want to compliment him upon the sympathetic assistance he has invariably given in order to relieve situations such as the one to which I will direct the attention of the committee provided, of course, he possesses the necessary legislative authority. But this is one in respect of which he cannot give relief because of the law as it now is.

A man in my own constituency joined the veterans' guard in July, 1940, served for seventeen months, and was discharged as unfit for further service. At the time he joined he had land under the soldier settlement board. Like so many soldiers settled after the last war, he did not pay his indebtedness and was still indebted at the outbreak of the present war. When he joined the veterans' guard an order in council which had been passed some years ago was resorted to by the board, and his wife's dependent's allowance was reduced by \$15 a month during the time he was in service, and was applied on account of his indebtedness to the government of Canada. When he came back from service unfit for service there was only one place to which he could go and that was back to the farm.

This bill is based upon an order in council passed in June, 1941, which is in almost identi-

cal words. Neither the bill nor the order in council covers the position of a man in this ex-soldier's position. He went back to his farm after discharge from the army. He has not had a crop for several years and applied for some assistance, and I would refer the committee to a letter he received from the district rehabilitation board in reply. He said to them that he could not get employment and was not entitled to unemployment insurance—such as the minister referred to as being payable in certain cases—and was in a bad financial plight. This is the answer he received:

Applicant was established on soldier settlement board farm at the time of his enlistment, July 8, 1940. During his period of service his wife carried on with the operation of the farm with the aid of hired help, and when discharged Hemmings returned to the farm to continue farming operations on the same basis as at the time of enlistment. Under these circumstances an award cannot be made under section 3, and if the family is in need it is a case for the municipal authorities.

That was February 18, 1942.

Mr. MARTIN: What branch of the service was he in?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: The veterans' guard.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Was he overseas?

Mr. DIEFENBAKER: He was overseas in the last war, but not in this one. He was fit when he joined; he gave service, and now that he is discharged he does not get a pension. During the time he was in the army, \$15 was being deducted from his wife's dependents allowance, and he is now advised to ask for relief assistance. I know that all hon. members will agree with me that relief is neither the award nor recompense that he deserves, and, I repeat, this bill affords him no consideration, and to take relief is all that remains for him.

Let me give another instance, that of a man who returned from overseas, invalidated home in 1941 and discharged at Regina, on December 23, 1941. His pay ceased on his discharge, and his wife's allowance was thereupon discontinued. The stores in his district cannot be expected to continue to give him credit, and he is now compelled to apply for relief, after having been in the service of his country overseas for a very considerable period of time.

These are two examples of men who have enlisted and who have been honourably discharged, and there is nothing whatever to cover their plight under this bill. They are not entitled to pension. There are three cardinal principles that guide all governments who are trying to do their part for these men. Those principles are these: Measures designed to assist