

Canadians, British-born and Canadian-born, came from the United States to enlist in the Canadian forces. They had never taken the oath of allegiance to the United States; they remained Canadian citizens. They went overseas with the Canadian forces; ultimately they returned, and instead of throwing themselves upon the country as they might have done they went back to the United States and resumed their ordinary occupations.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would my hon. friend pay soldiers who happened to be in England, Italy and France in the currency of those respective countries instead of in Canadian currency?

Mr. COPP: I am coming to that. Because of our currency being at a discount in the United States, pensioners who live in the United States and who receive their payments in Canadian money stand to lose to the extent of the discount. In the United Kingdom our currency is at a premium, so that if the matter was adjusted along these lines, Canada would not be paying any more, generally speaking, than she is paying now. The pensioner residing in the United States would get the same amount as the pensioner residing in Great Britain. The argument might be made that a pensioner residing in Great Britain is not in a foreign country. But the pensioner who resides in the United Kingdom is of no more benefit to Canada than the one who resides in the United States, and the premium on our currency in the one case would very largely offset the deficiency in the other. I did feel that the Pensions Committee should have given that advantage to the pensioner residing in the United States. I have had quite a number of telegrams and letters with regard to the matter. I feel that is something that the committee should have done, but the majority were of the other opinion. I think the Chairman will agree with me that I reserved the right to place my views before this committee, and I have done so in regard to the two or three items which I should like to have seen incorporated in the Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS: If my hon. friend's suggestion were carried out, great difficulties might present themselves. Supposing a pensioner started on a pleasure trip around the world. Would my hon. friend have the pension follow him to Havana, Japan and every other country he saw fit to visit?

Mr. POWER: He could not get around the world on his pension.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend is asking me a question which seems to me too unreasonable to take up any more time of the committee in attempting to answer it. This matter was brought to the attention of the committee and a conclusion was reached, after many compromises had been made. I may be wrong in regard to the matter, but I am only exercising my right, and I said in the committee that I would reserve the right to place my views before this committee. I have done so, and I feel it would have been the proper thing to have incorporated these provisions in the Bill. The majority of the committee, however, were opposed to this scheme, and I am prepared to bow to their decision.

Mr. EDWARDS: I hope my hon. friend will not think for a moment that I am trying to imply that he had no right to present his views in this House. I certainly had no such thought. Arguments may be advanced in support of the view of my hon. friend in regard to this matter, and I was merely endeavouring to point out some of the difficulties in the way of carrying it out. It is not sufficient to argue that a pension should be paid in the United States in American currency, taking that one country alone, because if you accept that principle, you must follow the pensioner no matter to what country he goes. That is logical, and that presents a difficulty which seems to point very clearly to the fact that the committee came to a wise decision when they decided to pay the pensioner in Canadian money no matter to what country he might go.

Mr. COPP: I did not argue that there were no difficulties in the way. I stated, as calmly and as considerately as I could, my views in regard to the matter. I have never, in connection with pensions or other benefits to returned men, argued that no difficulties presented themselves. As regards this scheme, I did not think the difficulties were insurmountable or I would not have brought it up. But difficulties have arisen and the majority of the committee have felt that they could not adopt this scheme. I have taken this opportunity of putting myself on record as otherwise it might have looked as if the committee had been unanimous on this point.

Mr. CALDWELL: At the outset I took the same view as that of my hon. friend (Mr. Copp); but when the committee came to consider the matter and the fact that