

(c) No mention has been made of certain other canteens, institutes and messes which are operating presumably at a profit. Reserve Army Units operate canteens in many places; and there are non-commissioned officers' and officers' messes in the three services. The Committee however does not suggest that these should contribute at the present time. Experience shows that profits made in officers' and non-commissioned officers' messes go largely to reduce the mess bills of the members. Moreover, these messes are not encouraged to make large profits. With regard to the Reserve Army Units, it is felt that they probably need any profit that can be realized for the purposes of their regimental funds.

6. Second Question: Whether there should be One Central Fund or Three (i.e. one for each service).

Some indication has already been given in the preceding paragraph of the views held by the service representatives on this question. The Air Force has already established a Benevolent Fund which is in active operation and which is receiving contributions from various sources. There seems to be very little doubt that the existence of such a fund tends to encourage private donations and other similar means of increasing its receipts, and the officers of the Air Force are to be congratulated on the vigorous manner in which they have fostered the fund and the careful thought that is apparent in the regulations for its use. The Air Force officers argued strenuously that their Benevolent Fund should be maintained as it stood and that if any percentage of canteen receipts were to be taken such moneys should be paid to the Benevolent Fund and not to a general central fund made up of contributions from the canteens operated in all three services.

A similar fund, although perhaps not so well organized nor so far advanced, exists in the Navy, and the representatives of the Navy also took a strong stand in favour of maintaining it and of applying to it any percentage of canteen profits which might be decided upon.

The view of the Army officers was perhaps not so strongly expressed, but was definitely favourable to the creation of a separate fund for each of the three services rather than one central fund for all. We were told that there would be confusion and difficulty in administration if the funds were not so separated. The General Officer Commanding, Canadian Corps, has cabled his view that there should be a fund for each service rather than a joint fund.

The Committee is of the opinion that the Benevolent Fund has a real place, both present and prospective, in the services: and that on a long range view these funds should be conserved for the purposes for which they are best suited, namely to encourage and promote esprit de corps and well-being in the respective services. We would suggest that they be placed on a strong legal basis, with an admixture of service and civil control to ensure continuity and sound administration. But we do not feel that they should be made responsible for the extraordinary load which will inevitably arise out of post-war demobilization.

While giving due weight to the opinions expressed by the service representatives, the Committee has come to the conclusion that the advantages of one central fund outweigh the arguments in favour of separate funds. We feel that the services are comparatively small permanent groups of service men which have been swollen to many times their normal size by the influx of thousands of civilians during the temporary conditions existing in wartime and that at the end of the war they will revert more or less to normal size again when demobilization takes place. While ex-members of the forces will no doubt carry with them into civil life the peculiar and natural pride in their own branch of the service, nevertheless the problems confronting them will be those of re-establishment for the future and here the exigencies of past service will play a small