

discharged from the service. I am satisfied that all deserving men will receive the gratuity which the country intended they should receive.

There is, however, one principle that does not seem to me to be altogether right. There are men to-day serving terms in the penitentiary. Some of these men were given a year or two or three years in the penitentiary for offences. When a man is punished by a court we can usually consider that the punishment he receives is the punishment to which he is entitled. Under our gratuity act a man can still, if the board of review so decides, have his gratuity taken away from him. The matter was brought up in the committee. It seems as though we were giving double punishment for one offence, which we might not regard as British justice. However, this point, like the others, was thoroughly discussed, and all members of the committee felt that no great injustice would be done with a board of review going over these cases individually and deciding each case on its merits.

Most of us who know the personnel of the board of review are satisfied that the type of men on the board is such that they will do justice to the returned men. It would not be fair or right for me to take up the time of the house in going into the bill section by section. That will be done by the committee. But looking back to 1944, when the purpose of the measure was set out, I find it was then stated that the purpose of the bill was to recognize the services of the members of His Majesty's forces who have been on active service and to assist them in their reestablishment. That is the purpose, to recognize the services of our forces and to assist them in their reestablishment.

I should like to point out ways in which I feel that this purpose of assisting the men in their reestablishment is being defeated. I have only to mention that in our opinion the two main things in reestablishment of returning men are, first, to provide the man with suitable and decent living quarters in this country and, second, to provide him with a job. This is not what we find in Canada to-day. Very much to our regret, many thousands of our men are returning to find that there are no homes to which they can take their families, and they are spending very much of their gratuity money in going from place to place looking for a proper home, for proper quarters for themselves and families.

Again, in the matter of looking for jobs it is common knowledge—our daily papers confirm it—that there are fewer jobs than there are men for them. Only this morning a report

stated that there were 40,000 more men looking for jobs to-day than there were jobs for them. This means that a great many returned men have to use the gratuity which was supposed to be for their reestablishment to keep themselves while they are looking for jobs.

There is another matter which I think might be mentioned as defeating the purpose of reestablishing our returned men, or, at least, a number of them. I mean the cases of the men whose wives are still in England. I have received a great many letters, as I am sure many members have, from men returning whose wives are still in England and who find it impossible to be reestablished here until those wives with their families are brought back from the old country.

It has been the contention of the Minister of National Defence that our soldiers should be brought back first. In general, we can, perhaps, agree with that point of view. Still, if we had properly organized the return of our men to this country I think we could have brought back thousands of these wives at the same time. I had a letter from a man who said that he had been in the air force for four years. He had been married for four years and had seen his wife for only eleven days in that time. He was back in Canada now; it looked as though it would be months before his wife and child could be brought out to this country, and it was impossible for him to be re-established until they came. A ship might have been set aside to assist in bringing out the wives of these men.

I believe also there are thousands of men who have been returning to Canada who spent only a short time overseas. We talk about first in, first out, but we all know that is a principle which has not been followed. Many thousands of men have been returned here who had only a short service overseas. I believe the wives of men who had served for four or five years on the other side should have been given preference over those men who had such little service. I might go farther. I believe, knowing the chivalry of the soldiers of this country, had it been requested of them, there would have been no difficulty at all in obtaining some of the space they have taken for bringing these stranded wives to Canada.

We are satisfied that this bill is the expression of the opinion of the returned men of this house. It also expresses the opinion of the veterans who gave us advice. Over the last twenty-five years we have had what we have considered to be very fine veterans' acts. There is no question about that. On paper they look good; but we have also found that in the administration of those acts there