fancy to the services he could render to them, they did not allow him to go to France. They kept him in England. He was there for four years. He died some time ago; I have just forgotten the date. His widow has been appealing to me to see if she could not receive some consideration. Because her husband did not serve in France during the war, she gets mighty little return for his four years' service in England. Therefore I agree with all that has been said by the other hon. members. Surely the time has come when those who served in England and were kept there against their will -because this particular man did his best to get over to France, as I know many others did-should receive consideration, and when England should be considered as having been a theatre of war in the first great war. I support what was said by the previous speakers in that regard.

I now wish to refer to the imperials. I remember very well that, in the part of the city in which I live, prior to the great war all sorts of rifle companies were in existence. These people nearly all came from the old country. Nearly every family I knew came from there. They formed rifle battalions and practised shooting, and one military exercise and another in that part of the city. Anticipating the storm that was approaching at that time, quite a number of them went to the old country immediately before war was declared and enlisted in regiments in Great Britain. I have in mind two brothers. One of them rushed over to Britain in order to be ready to defend his homeland. The other, who was not able to go from Canada at that time, later went over after the war was declared and fought in the great war. After the war was over, the one who, preceding the opening of the war, had gone to Britain, served faithfully over there, and was badly wounded, came back to Canada again because he liked Canada. His British pension is not one, two, three with that of his brother who served in the Canadian forces.

I endorse everything that was said by previous speakers. Surely to goodness the time has come to consider the imperial veterans of that class and, in addition, the imperial veterans who came out and lived here for twenty years. I believe the hon member for Wentworth strongly emphasized the twenty-year limit for imperial veterans, with regard to both pension and war veterans allowance. I cannot add anything to what he and others have said in that regard, but I strongly endorse what they have said. These men served in the defence of the empire and of Canada in the first war, and surely they should receive some recognition. It is not their fault

that the dear old mother country has been so drained of resources, both at home and abroad, that she is on her back today. It is not their fault that the homeland cannot give them the same recompense as is given to their brothers who were here in Canada.

I for one have every confidence that, now the minister has started on his way, he will consider the representations which have been made today by those whose knowledge of this matter is much greater than my own. I have taken very little part in discussions of this kind, and I do so now mostly because of the thousands and thousands of old country people who live in my part of the city of Toronto. A great majority of them served in the first war, and in many cases their sons and daughters served in the last war.

I am happy that consideration is being given to the widows of soldiers who served in England. Many of those widows were without pensions for a long time. As the minister knows, I was the first one in the house to bring up the question of non-pensioned widows' pensions. I was always supported by the hon, member for Winnipeg North Centre after he came to the house. I spoke the strongest words at my command on their behalf. I have seen so many of them die without recognition and without receiving what they should have received.

I trust that the minister will take into his warm consideration, not only the claims of the imperial veterans and of those who served in England but did not get to France, but also of the widows of those who did serve.

Mr. LOCKHART: I wish to say just a word, because I do not want to repeat what has been said previously. I did not have the privilege of sitting on this committee, but I do want to express regret that certain phases of this matter were not treated favourably. In my own area there is a very active organization of British Canadian veterans. I have listened to the presentations made by different hon. members, especially the hon. member for Nanaimo, and I in turn could cite dozens of cases where inconsistency has occurred, apparently because of the attitude of certain members of the veterans committee.

I am rather confused in trying to understand why the members of the committee split on party lines. It seems to me that the interests of these men and the widows of these men who served so valiantly should be above that. There appears to be a feeling among British Canadian veterans, among the widows of those who served in different branches of the services, among those who have not received recognition, that there is still some faint hope; that a new outlook is possible with the advent of the new minister.