1914.		1918.	
Sugar6c. a lb24c.	a	lb.	
Bread6c. a loaf16c.	a	loaf.	
Butter25c. a lb70c.	a	lb.	
Beef25c. a lb. 60c.	a	tb.	
Milk			
Bacon	a	tb.	
House Rent\$15 a month\$45	a	month.	
Coal\$6.50 a ton\$18	a	ton.	
Clothing \$15 a suit \$45	00	a suit.	

The foregoing figures speak for themselves, and prove that for a considerable period of time an economic condition existed, so far as the soldiers' families were concerned (over which they had absolutely no control) which made it impossible for them to make both ends meet. It was the obvious duty of the Government to compensate every member of the C.E.F. for the indisputable loss in the purchasing power of their wages, which had been calculated on a pre-war basis.

In support of the contention that **compensation** should be granted, the following additional arguments are submitted.

## CIVIL SERVICE BONUS.

The attention of the Premier, the Hon. Mr. Arthur Meighen, is drawn to the statement of the Minister of Finance, Sir Henry Drayton, who in the early part of the year 1920, brought before the House of Commons a bill, providing for the payment of bonuses to civil servants, and involving the appropriation of \$12,000,000. Speaking on behalf of the bill, Sir Henry Drayton, Minister of Finance, informed the House that it would be an injustice to withhold the bonuses in question from civil servants. who by virtue of the fact of being state employees were unable to take advantage of the high wages prevalent in the industrial world during the period of the war, and as a consequence suffered financial losses which adversely affected their material comfort, and this taken in conjunction with the existing high cost of living, was urged as proof that it was the duty of the Government to protect the self-sacrificing servants of the State by granting them a bonus to compensate them for the high cost of living. The Government granted the bonus asked for; and the members of the House apparently approved the arguments used by Sir Henry Drayton.

In presenting the case for the ex-member of the C.E.F., we agree with the arguments used by so eminent an authority as the Minister of Finance on behalf of the Government. The arguments appear to us to be reason-