

position to make any saving, indeed, it is more than probable that during the high period of last year, many went into debt, and, as the inclination of the committee throughout their inquiries was to err on the side of generosity, it was agreed that until we had a more definite and permanent return to pre-war prices, no reduction should be made.

Intensely bitter complaints were voiced to the committee against the decision of last year that the bonus of 50 per cent should apply only to those who are resident in Canada, while the former pension of 20 per cent was continued to those living outside of the country. This discrimination was felt more keenly by Canadian pensioners residing in the United States, both because of the discount which they had to pay on their pension cheques, and as well for the reason that in the American republic the totally disabled unmarried pensioner receives \$100 a month, or \$1,200 a year. This is, I believe, the single instance in which the pensions paid by Canada to the rank and file fall below those of any other country. Even in the United States, the pension to the totally disabled married man is exactly the same as that now paid to the Canadian, while the disabled Canadian pensioner with a family receives sensibly more than does the American.

It may be argued that these men reside south of the Canadian border of their own volition, and that if they desire to take advantage of the more attractive rates in this country, they should move to Canada. In fairness to them it should be said that for the most part they are either Canadians, or men of British origin, who before the war were living in the United States. Fired by sentiment they enlisted with our forces before their then adopted country entered the struggle. Further, it is alleged that Canadian recruiting agencies at that time promised those volunteers they would be treated on exactly the same basis as those who were enlisting in Canada. It is but natural that men who enlisted in the United States should return to their homes and friends, nor am I able to seriously criticise the Canadian who after the war, finding it difficult to obtain employment in Canada, discovered for himself a job in the land to the south. The committee recommends that the distinction raised, I believe for the first time last year, between pensioners within and outside of Canada, should now be withdrawn, as from September 1, next, and that all be placed on an equal footing. We believe, however, the former sound rule of

paying funds in Canadian currency should be continued, although this may result in a loss to those who reside in the United States and a gain to those living in Great Britain.

To this point we have been considering only the cases of those who are wholly disabled, or the dependents of those who have fallen. It must not be forgotten that there exists a much larger class numerically, of men who have suffered some partial disability, and are awarded a proportionate amount of pension. The problem of the partially disabled man has been rendered distinctly more acute by the depression in trade and industry, with its consequent unemployment. No amount of theorizing can alter the fact, hard and even cruel though it may be, that in competition with the fit man, whose efficiency should be 100 per cent, the disabled will too often fail of employment. It is easy to justify the logical ruling that a man 50 per cent disabled should not get more than one-half of the amount paid to his wholly disabled brother. Indeed should you pay more than 50 per cent pension to a man 50 per cent disabled, how much more are you going to pay the man whose disability is fixed at 60—70—80 or 90 per cent? And yet the stubborn condition remains, that the man who has had half of his capacity for work destroyed, and who is in theory, and frequently in appearance, only 50 per cent efficient, gets but a limited chance to earn even half the wage of the fit workman. This is not to be wondered at, because most of the jobs in the industrial world call for fully efficient labour, and the posts that can be properly filled by disabled men are not only few but are usually reserved for the old employee, or for the man who has been injured in the industry which still employs him.

Under the heading of "Re-establishment" will be found certain suggestions which it is hoped may aid in overcoming this difficult situation; a discussion of these will be postponed until that point is reached.

Perhaps I have continued at too great length on this one line, but I shall hope to pass more rapidly over the other section of the report dealing with pensions.

The House will recall the position of the widowed mother and the pleas made in her favour, both during this and former sessions. The report of the committee deals fully with this subject, and I do not think I can do better than to read the paragraphs which relate thereto:—