

another, that it was just a question whether it carried. It was lost by one vote on one occasion and by three on another, and if a few more of the opposition members had been present the decision might have been reversed. In view of the fact that there is such a strong demand in Canada that each of these resolutions shall be adopted, and a strong demand, not merely on the part of veterans organizations but among various civilian bodies in the country, I would urge the minister to take the matter up with the cabinet and try to have the whole subject reconsidered, so that the amount of the allowance for single veterans may be increased to \$50 and for married veterans to \$85. Further, I suggest that England be considered an actual theatre of war and that imperials who have resided in Canada for twenty years or more be eligible for war veterans allowance.

Mr. PEARKES: I associate myself with those who have spoken, and I express regret, almost resentment, that the allowances have not been extended to meet the suggestions advanced by the Canadian Legion, both as regards the amount of the allowance and also as regards the extension of the provisions to include imperials who have had long residence in Canada, and those Canadian soldiers who served only in Great Britain during world war I. They served only in Great Britain, but that was no fault of theirs. It was due to the exigencies of the service or to the demand for their particular talent in training other men.

I have already spoken during this session on both these classes of veterans. I will not now repeat the remarks I have made previously, but I wish to bring to the attention of the committee one striking fact to illustrate the irony of the regulations which prohibit a soldier of world war I who served only in Great Britain from drawing these allowances. The allowances are available to any soldier of world war I who served on the continent of Europe up to the date of the conclusion of hostilities at that time. I remind the committee that the armistice was signed on the eleventh day of November 1918, but the war was not declared over until August 1920. Therefore a man might have left Canada after the signing of the armistice, and after a short period of training in Great Britain he might have been sent over to reinforce one of the battalions forming the army of occupation, being billeted in a comfortable house on the banks of the Rhine, suffering no hardship at all and returning at the conclusion of peace when the army of occupation returned to England. That man is eligible for all the considerations and the benefits of this act.

Similarly a man who went over to Great Britain, who did not see any fighting at all, who did not move to the continent of Europe until after the armistice, might have been attached then to some of the labour battalions connected with the imperial war graves commission. That man is also eligible for these benefits.

But the soldier who went over in 1914, who was exposed to the hardship of Salisbury plain, whose health perhaps was ruined, and who remained in Great Britain training other men for many years, perhaps right up to the conclusion of hostilities, separated from his family all that time, is not eligible for the benefits provided.

That is so ironical it is well worth further consideration. I hope the minister will bear these facts in mind and remember that this legislation is never finished. It is like history, unfinished business. I hope that when, between now and next session, he reviews this legislation with a view to bringing down further amendments he will realize that the granting of adequate allowances, the granting of allowances at all to imperials, and to the men of world war I in the Canadian forces who remained only in Great Britain for a period of over eighteen months, is still a matter of unfinished business.

Mr. KNOWLES: May I say once again that those of us who are not veterans are grateful for the hard work which the veteran members of the special committee have done on behalf of their comrades. I think it is also true to say that in the house and generally throughout the country there will be disappointment that more was not accomplished.

I support the suggestion made by the hon. member for Nanaimo that this is unfinished business, and I hope that the government will continue to consider the points raised by those who have spoken thus far this afternoon.

In the first place—and I think this is the view of the citizens of Canada generally—we feel that something better than \$40 a month should be done for those whom we know as burnt-out pensioners. There is on the part of Canadians generally a great deal of sympathy for these old soldiers who have become known as burnt-out pensioners, and in the light of today's cost of living, \$40 a month is not good enough.

I am sorry that, although the committee did make a change, as I read the reprinted bill, incorporating the extra \$10 as part of the allowance itself rather than as a supplementary allowance, the value of that has been somewhat lost by the reduction of the amount of other allowable income from \$250 to \$125.

I know there is now no ceiling on what is called casual income, but I think that is likely