

involve additional expenditure, because of the fact that in some cities men employed on elevators, receiving below the maximum amount permitted under the act, would be in a position to claim sufficient allowance from war veterans' allowance to bring their wages up in accordance with the maximum amount allowed, namely, \$480 for a married man and \$240 for a single man. What I had in mind was this, and I think that in the great majority of cases to which it would apply it would mean no additional expenditure. Men who were employed in industry, having had these years of war service, followed by years of employment in heavy industry, are likely to break down for a time. Take the case of a man in that situation at fifty years of age, which is about the average present age of the ex-service man. He has a rest for six months or a year, and rebuilds himself to the point where he can do a little of something. But he is restricted to earning just half what the war veterans' allowance permits him. I do not think there would be anything wrong with granting sufficient latitude to those who administer the act that in such cases, after investigation, men should not be prevented from earning a certain amount of money to augment the war veterans' allowance, in some occupation which was not their previous occupation. It seems to me to be a matter of administration; I do not think there is any necessity of changing the act. There could be an understanding that the board could deal with cases such as I have described. I am not speaking of the man who is working for \$240 or \$480 a year; he is not working at all, he is on a pension; there is something wrong with his head if he will work for that amount. But in the cases I have described, many men I know who are receiving a war veterans' allowance have the feeling, "If I go out and try to earn \$200 it means a reexamination of the case and the possibility of disturbing the arrangement"; and as a consequence, men who really could be doing something are sitting at home and deteriorating. If the minister would make an investigation and have some understanding with the board along the lines I have suggested, it would eliminate a lot of resentment.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I am informed the difficulty is that to some extent at least the regulations are based on those of the old age pensions legislation. There is voted every year by this parliament \$32,000,000 for old age pension purposes, and this vote is about \$8,000,000, and the idea has been to keep a balance of benefit between the two systems. Whether my hon. friend's

[Mr. Gillis.]

suggestion can be carried out I cannot at the moment say, but certainly I shall be glad to consider it carefully.

Mr. GREEN: When the minister is considering the War Veterans' Allowance Act during the adjournment, will he also take into consideration the advisability or otherwise of including under that act men who served in the imperial forces who have been in Canada for, say, a period of fifteen years? I believe recommendations were made to the committee that those who came to this country before 1930 should be covered. Others said that they should have been here fifteen years, and some argued that the minimum period should be twenty years. I would ask the minister to take into consideration the case of these imperial veterans.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes. As my hon. friend is aware, strong recommendations were made—by the Canadian Legion in particular—in regard to these men. I can hold out no definite promise, but I shall be very glad to take my hon. friend's observations into consideration.

Mr. GREEN: There was not time to consider the question thoroughly in the committee, and for that reason we find no recommendation in its report. But this is a very important matter, and should be given consideration.

Mr. BLACKMORE: There was one remark made by the minister to which I should like to give a little attention. As I gathered it, he conveyed the idea that the fault with respect to our war veterans' allowance is not that the War Veterans' Allowance Act is not sufficiently generous, but that our other social legislation is deficient. I think I gathered that aright. Well, I believe we ought to take for granted as a basis of our thinking this statement, that our social legislation generally in Canada is deficient. For example, I understand that New Zealand grants mothers' maternity benefits for each child. I understand also that New Zealand is granting the old age pension at the age of sixty. I have not had an opportunity of verifying those two statements, but I think they are correct.

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): On a contributory basis.

Mr. BLACKMORE: Yes—well, on any basis whatever. The simple fact remains that in Canada we cannot get it on any basis. These are only two examples of the way in which Canada is lagging far behind other progressive civilized countries in the matter of social services.