

siders the sum mentioned as being necessary to increase veterans allowances to \$50 a month, to give allowances to imperials who have lived in Canada for twenty years and to give veterans allowances to Canadians who served in England, he realizes that it is not beyond the easy capacity of the Canadian people to pay. I am sure these payments would receive the endorsement of Canadians as a whole.

In that respect my principal argument would be that the defence of Canada is a national responsibility. Therefore I, in common with many other members of the committee, maintain that those who suffered disabilities of war are entitled to be cared for by the nation. Their care is a national responsibility. While this bill is a great improvement on the one presented to the committee, and while the recommendations have been accepted in several respects, I suggest that the minister and the government should give further consideration to increasing the allowance to \$50 a month, giving veterans allowances to imperials resident in Canada for twenty years, and to Canadians who served in England, in view of the fact that many people maintain—and, I believe, rightly so—that the care of those who suffered by war is a national responsibility.

Mr. MOORE: I do not intend to take up much time of the committee, but perhaps as a member of the committee on veterans affairs I should congratulate the minister upon the fine spirit he has shown in dealing with veterans problems.

I regret, however, that the committee found it difficult to obtain changes in the War Veterans Allowance Act. It was noticeable that the government accepted the changes suggested by the committee so far as the Pension Act is concerned, but it was not quite so ready to accept changes with respect to the War Veterans Allowance Act.

I do not wish to cover any of the ground already covered; but, because of the large amount of correspondence received in the past year, I would say that the recommendation of the committee that England be considered a theatre of war in the first world war, within the meaning of the act, should be reconsidered by the government.

Another matter which should be brought to the attention of the government is that of applications for war veterans allowance by soldiers of the Canadian army who saw service only in Canada. I happen to have a number of applications from men who served for at least two years in Canada and who are now in necessitous circumstances. Because benefits under this act can be granted only for service

performed in a theatre of actual war, they cannot be included. Something should be done to relieve the circumstances under which most of these people are now forced to live. The high cost of living has had a great deal to do with the applications now coming in for increased benefits under veterans legislation.

Mr. LENNARD: There is one situation I should like to describe on the record, because to my mind it is stupid. It seems odd that two departments of the same government cannot agree as to whether a man is or is not employable. Under the regulations which apply with respect to the War Veterans Allowance Act, a man must be permanently unemployable before he can qualify for the allowance. The unemployment insurance commission say that a man must be available and able to work before benefits under their scheme are payable. Yet a man who can qualify for war veterans allowance must expend his unemployment insurance benefits or credits first.

How can a man who is permanently unemployable be available for work? If a man qualifies for a war veterans allowance, why cannot his unemployment insurance benefits or credits be disregarded, so that he can be paid his war veterans allowance from the day he qualifies? The position of an individual could be indicated on paper. This would save a man a good deal of running around and standing in line at employment offices, when it is a foregone conclusion he will not be employed anyway.

I wanted to put that statement on record, so that the department could straighten the matter out in the next year, and thereby prevent this stupid arrangement from continuing.

Mr. SKEY: While the department is considering the matters mentioned by the hon. member for Wentworth, I suggest that it might consider the domicile clause in the Pension Act and gratuities and rehabilitation benefits. I know the minister and his deputy are aware of the situation. It seems to me wrong that we should consider a man eligible for rehabilitation in Canada and for all these benefits, and then if he has lost a leg or an arm in war, permit the domicile clause, which is different from that in the rehabilitation measure, to take away from him pension benefits to which he would be justly entitled.

Section agreed to.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3—Maximum allowance in certain cases.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): This is the main section of the bill, and provides for