

non-permanent active service. I think I should also point out that this is not free, that if a man wishes to avail himself of the service, he will have to make a contribution which will be related to the benefit to be obtained. Consequently this is not nearly as serious as it might be thought to be by hon. members who are not quite as familiar with the provisions as others. This was, as I say, adopted last year. One-quarter was thought to be a fair amount, having regard to the part-time nature of the non-permanent active militia and the working reserve. Taken together with the other provisions, it was considered to be a generous one.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Would the minister explain why this section is so restrictive? A man in the permanent force of the army must have served with the militia and the militia only. A man in the air force must have served in the air force auxiliary and the same thing is true of the navy. Our whole move today is to have the service regarded as one service. As far as the air force is concerned, particularly before the war I know it was very difficult for a young lad who was keen to serve, to get into the auxiliary air force. One reason for that was that there were so few units. Even in places like Vancouver, where there was a unit, it was very difficult for a young man who was keen to serve in the non-permanent force to get into the auxiliary air force. As a consequence, a great number of them joined the militia, which they could do. If these men should stay on in the permanent air force, having joined the air force, it seems unfair to me that their militia time before the war should not be counted on their pension plan.

Mr. CLAXTON: The answer to the hon. member's question is this. The idea has been to count only service in the reserve of the arm of the service in which the man serves in the permanent force. That was deliberately done. It was made restrictive. It has been so since 1910. There is no change in it. It is considered to be a fair provision.

Mr. FULTON: We did not have an air force in 1910.

Mr. CLAXTON: It was reenacted in 1940 and in 1946; it received consideration on all those occasions, and no reason to change it has been found.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): The very fact that it was good in 1910 definitely does not make it good today. In 1910, for example, we had no air force; and the one lesson which we should have learned out of

this war is the need of having just one armed service for Canada. It certainly does seem ridiculous deliberately to exclude lads who did give the best sort of non-permanent service before the war, simply because they are not now in the little pigeonhole they were in before. Therefore, seconded by the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River, I should like to move in amendment that in paragraphs (A), (B) and (C) the last words "in respect of army personnel", "in respect of air force personnel" and "in respect of naval personnel" be deleted. The effect of that will be that a man who served in any branch of the non-permanent forces can get one-quarter of the time spent in any branch of the permanent forces.

Mr. CLAXTON: I regret having to do so, but I would point out that this clause as it stands and as amended, if the amendment were to carry, would impose a charge on the treasury; and consequently I submit that it is out of order.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): I agree with the minister on that point. Perhaps the minister will give a little better explanation on the committee as to why he is perpetuating this disunity as regards pension rights for the services.

Mr. FULTON: Ask him if he will move the amendment himself.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Vancouver North): Thank you very much.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): Shall the clause carry?

Mr. COCKERAM: There are two or three things about this clause that I do not understand, and one is why there should be the difference in the time. I heard the remarks made about militia service, and I think any one who served in the militia during peace time knows it entailed a great deal of service given at night and on week-ends. In the years when we were coming nearer to war, the men who served in the militia spent a lot of time. I was surprised when this amendment came in that there should be a change of this kind. After the first great war it was considered that a man who served in the militia should be given half-time for his permanent force pension. Today, on the ground of economy, I suppose, it is cut down to a quarter, and I do not think that is fair to those men who gave their time or to the men who are today giving their time in the militia.

Mr. CLAXTON: That change was made last year.