

Mr. POWER: I want to point out another peculiar anomaly in the Act, which has never struck me before. We make up the difference in pensions to people living in our country who served in the military forces of Great Britain or of the Allied countries; for instance, the widow of an Allied soldier who obtains a smaller pension than we give has her pension made up to our own scale, and yet when our widowed mothers live in another country we reduce their pensions. This discriminatory treatment seems to me most absurd. During the three years that I have been on the Pensions Committee this clause has been discussed time and again, but only at this moment has the point which I now emphasize come to my attention.

Mr. McMASTER: A domiciled Canadian citizen who had lived here for some fourteen years before the war broke out was summoned to the French colours in August, 1914. He went overseas, joined the French army, was awarded the Croix de Guerre for gallantry, and returned after the war was over. If he had gone into the English army and the English pension granted him—for he lost part of both hands—was smaller than the Canadian pension, our Government would have made up the deficiency to him. Now, does this amendment cover such a case as that? Is the pension of such a man to be brought up to what it would have been had he enlisted in the Canadian army?

Mr. CALDER: I understand that this question was up last year; in fact, I think the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) brought the same instance to the attention of the House. I am told that the report of the Pensions Committee has made no change in the law so far as cases of that kind are concerned.

Mr. McMASTER: If that man had been a British reservist and had been called to the British colours, he would have received the same pension as if he had enlisted in the Canadian army. But he joined the French colours, and he fought just as bravely as he would have fought if he had been in the British army; he suffered and bled for our cause the same as he would have done in the British army. I think it is very unfair that he should receive a smaller pension than his brother British reservist who joined the British colours.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka): Was he a Canadian citizen?

[The Chairman.]

Mr. McMASTER: Yes, and had been for some years prior to the war. He left a wife and six children on this side when he went overseas.

Mr. NESBITT: If he had been a Canadian citizen and had joined the Imperial army he would have been entitled to equalization of pension. This clause is to provide for equalization of pension for the dependent, not for the man himself.

Section agreed to.

On section 30—commencement of Act:

Mr. COPP: As the chairman of the committee will remember, I reserved the right when the report of the committee was being prepared to bring certain matters before this committee and to place myself on record with regard thereto. During the sittings of the committee I attended as frequently as I could. While the advisability of adopting a number of things was a matter of argument, the committee generally came to unanimous decision as to what we could do in the interests of the soldiers, having in mind the financial situation and the different matters that were presented to the committee for consideration. There are two or three things I would have liked to have seen in the report and in the Bill. One was discussed yesterday,—a proposal to grant loans to fishermen. Another provision I would like to have seen in the Bill is one which would increase from eighteen years to twenty-one years the age limit in respect of assistance in the matter of education. I think that any young man who enlisted before attaining the age of twenty years or should be given this aid with regard to his education as is general to those who enlisted prior to eighteen years of age. Of course, twenty-one years is an arbitrary age to determine upon, but it has been adopted by this country as the age at which manhood is attained, so that up to that age the soldier should be considered as a boy. The majority of the committee were not with me in that regard.

Mr. NESBITT: This is a matter which comes under re-establishment, and will be dealt with later.

Mr. COPP: Well, I have put myself on record, anyway. I was also of the opinion that pensioners now residing in the United States should be paid in New York funds. The amount involved would not be a very large one for the Dominion of Canada to assume. As the member for Quebec South (Mr. Power) has said, a large number of