

Mr. NESBITT: Having listened to all the arguments I take it that this particular situation is a unique situation and that exact circumstances such as this have not arisen before. Now, I know, Mr. Chairman, that rulings in the past on similar situations are always used to guide us when a different situation arises, but I think it is necessary sometimes to make distinctions on the individual facts of the situation. I know, and many members of this committee know, how courts make very fine distinctions sometimes. In this particular case one of the important things mentioned by the chairman was that the previous motions, before the committee commenced its proceedings, to extend the terms of reference were ruled out of order by the speaker in the House and that that would prevent any similar recommendations being made by this committee. But, I think that a set of facts have come up in this case that are different from the ones before. This special committee only had four bills referred to it for study—that is quite true, I agree with the Chairman—and we were asked to call witnesses and so on with reference to the four bills. We had evidence from the Legion and from the other veterans' groups and from various departmental officials and so on. Now, these four bills that we had to study were not different in nature. They all related to veterans' problems specifically and in many ways they were interrelated to the very Act in question. I think that is one of the main points, that all this legislation that we had to consider was related. It all dealt with a similar subject. In this particular case, after having heard the evidence on all four bills that dealt with related subjects, evidence was presented to us which had not been before by those various bodies. Some recommendations regarding changes as to war veterans allowances, permissive income and so on, would be of great benefit to the veterans of the country. That is the evidence that we had from all these various witnesses. Since this evidence came up before the committee with relation to these four bills which are all related, and which certainly bear some relationship to the War Veterans Allowance Act, there is no argument about that. I think it would be very proper and quite in order for this committee to submit a report to the House requesting that the terms of reference of the committee be enlarged, because of this evidence which has come before the committee as a result of the evidence that we have taken in connection with four similar bills, which are all related to each other, as to the war veterans allowances. I think that you could very well rule, in view of that, that this resolution would be in order. Whether, of course, it is passed by this committee is another matter. With respect, I think that that is the case. Now, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned that the way in which you thought we could get this on the record to be referred back to the House was in this part of the draft report which you had drawn up. It reads:

—your committee desires to draw attention to the fact—
and so on,

—in addition to representations in respect of the said bills, representations urging changes in the War Veterans Allowance Act to raise the amounts of allowances payable thereunder, and also to raise the level of permissive income.

In that particular part you are just saying that that was evidence which was presented to this particular committee. We draw attention to that evidence because it was very prominently put forward. It does not indicate, to my way of thinking, except the words "desires to draw attention," which could mean anything, what the feelings are of maybe a few or maybe all members of this committee—I do not know. To put in something of that nature looks very much to me like the old expression: "Mother, may I go down to swim?" "Yes, my darling daughter. Hang your clothes on a hickory limb, but don't