3 - 3 .3

ar care

the state of the s

SCHEDULE OF MONTHLY PENSION RATES

(For Class I or 100% Pensioner)

<u>s</u>		Widow Per	nsioner
% INCREASE	FROM PRESENT RATE	TO NEW RATE	ž INCREASI
	Widow		
16%	60.00	70.00	16.67%
- 4.4%	66.67	70.00	. 5%
	84.00)		•
	104.00)	* 18	
•	126.00)	No Change	• • . ·
	180.00)		
;		***	
20%		N. A.	
20%	15,00	18.00	20%
16.67%	12.00	14,00	16.67%
20%	10.00	12.00	20%
	16% 4.4%	FROM PRESENT RATE	FROM TO NEW RATE Widow

All Ranks

First child	30.00	36.00	20%
Second child	24.00	28.00	16:67%
Each subsequent child	20.00	24.00	20%

(Classes below Class I (100%) are increased proportionately)

Disabilities below 5% All Ranks final payment not exceeding formerly \$100.00 now \$115.00

The maximum rate for a dependent parent is increased as for widows.

EXAMPLES OF PROPOSED PENSION INCREASES

	, 			
•	<u>.</u>	PRESENT SCALE	NEW SCALE	in in state of the community of the comm
100%	Pensioner (Lieut. or below)	. \$ 75.00	\$ 87.00	
	Wife:	25 00	30.00	्राप्ति । हुक्य ख्वा
	First Child	. 15.00	18.00	A CARD STORY
	Second "	12.00	14.00	Y The second
	Third "	10.00	12.00	
		\$137.00	\$161.00	
	Widow (Lieut. or below)	60.00	70.00	
	First Child	.: 15.00	18.00	· 15-0
	Second "	. 12.00	14.00	2 - 12 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -
;	Third "	. 10.00	_12.00_	1
		\$ 97.00	\$114.00	
			1	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
50%	Pensioner (Lieut. or below) with wife and 3 children		\$ 80.50	
10%	Pensioner (Lieut. or below) with wife and 3 children		\$ 16.10	
			•	

SCHEDULE OF MONTHLY TRAINING ALLOWANCES

University And Vocational Training

(Sections 7, 8 and 9 of Veterans Rehabilitation Act)

<u>PR</u>	FROM RESENT RATE	NEW RATE	INCREASE
Veteran Student	60.00	60.00	NIL
Wife		30.00	50%
One child	12.00	18.00	50%
Second child	12.00	14.00	16.67%
Third child	10.00	12.00	20%
Fourth end subsequent child	8.00	10.00	25%

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S POWERS.

OUESTION OF CORRESPONDENCE: In the House of Commons, February 12, J.I. Hamel (B.P. St. Maurice-Lafleche) brought to the notice of the Secretary of State for External Affairs articles published in Le Devoir of Montreal regarding the issue of new letters patent governing the office and appointment of the Governor General, Mr. Hamel asked if any changes had been made concerning the signing of our diplomatic representatives' credentials. If so, what were the changes.

At the time, Mr. St. Laurent read a Press: announcement on the subject issued by the Prime Minister, Oct. 1, 1947 (C.W.B. October 3. 1947) and promised to look into the articles.

Reverting to the question, February 16, Mr. St. Laurent made the following statement to the House:

On February 12, I indicated to the house that I would examine the press articles referred to by the hon. member for St. Maurice-Lafleche (Mr. Hamel) in his question of that day in connection with the new letters patent governing the office of Governor General of Canada. I have now had an opportunity of doing, so and also of reading a subsequent article published in Le Devoir on February 13. This last article bears the title: "Mr. St. Laurent: quite annoyed at the leakage of the state. secret."

IMPROPRIETY OF PUBLICITY

I hope I did not display any annoyance--which I certainly did not feel -- though I was concerned to find that there had been any leakage about confidential correspondence between the Prime Minister of Canada and the secretary of His Majesty the King inhis capacity as King of Canada. My concern was not over the contents of the correspondence but over. the impropriety of publicity about something which, not only by tradition and by courtesy but also by proper constitutional practice, and even by the implication of the ministerial, oaths of office, has always been and should be treated as highly confidential.

Of course it could be no secret that there must have been correspondence in connection with the new letters patent since it was apparent they were signed by His Majesty himself in London and authenticated under the Great Seal of Canada and countersigned by the Prime Minister of Canada in Ottawa. But the form and tenor of that correspondence was just as confidential as would have been their conversation if the Prime Minister of Canada had approached His Majesty in person at Buckingham Palace or elsewhere and the completion of the letters patent been arranged orally.

RESPONSIBILITY OF GOVERNMENT

Nor was it any secret that though the terms of these letters patent made it legally possible for the governor general, on the advice of Canadian ministers, to exercise any of the powers and authorities of the crown in respect of Canada, without the necessity of submission being made to His Majesty, including among others, royal full powers for the issuance of letters of credence for Canadian ambassadors and foreign ministers, there was no legal necessity: to: alter existing practices: and that it would be the responsibility of the government of Canada, in any prerogative matter affecting Canada, to determine whether the submission should go to His Majesty or to the governor general.

What I have just stated was made perfectly clear to the press by the Prime Minister on October 1, 1947. What gave me some concern is the publication of garbled and speculative accounts of when this correspondence is supposed to have been exchanged and what it is supposed to contain.

Though the publication of the correspondence would at once dispel all this, the government is not disposed to take that easy way of dispelling it, because at best it would be discourteous to His Majesty and because of its possible effect as a precedent on confidential