

board from three to two, and there are about five or six minor changes, mostly in connection with routine matters.

Mr. MacINNIS: The debate on this resolution has been fairly wide in scope. From my experience with the pension board over a number of years, I feel that they do their best to administer the act as fairly as possible. When they do not accede to demands or requests, it is because they cannot go beyond the act. There are thousands of people in Canada who are not returned men, who did not serve in the armed forces but who find themselves to-day in the same position as many of those who did serve in the last war. The extent of economic need is the reason why we have such difficulty in dealing with veterans' problems. It is a wide economic question and we cannot deal with it through the Pension Act. It can be dealt with only by a social security act which would make provision for the economic needs of all affected. I do not want to take anything away from those who have served in the armed forces, but the man who is a casualty of industry should be provided for in a way similar to the means by which we provide for men who have served in the armed forces. We cannot deal with this question or with the disabilities that affect our returned men without improving general economic conditions. We must make the social conditions of the country better for those who have not served in the armed forces as well as for those who have. They must be made better for all the civilian population. When we start doing that, we shall be making a beginning of dealing with the problems of the returned men in a way that will be more satisfactory than that now followed.

Mrs. NIELSEN: I am glad to hear that there is a possibility that the committee will discuss the matter of widows of veterans. I have come in contact with numerous groups of these women, and it would appear that a great injustice has been done during the last few years. In many instances these women have had to go on relief, and they regard this as charity. They feel they have every reason in the world to expect the government to take care of them without their having to resort to charity. They feel they are entitled to a just reward for having willingly sent their husbands to serve during the last war.

There is another question I should like to put to the minister in connection with children of ex-service men. Suppose a man is receiving pension and dies, and then after a time his widow marries. Would the young children still be eligible for pension?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes, but certain amendments are proposed to meet other situations affecting children.

Mrs. NIELSEN: That will be considered by the committee?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): Yes.

Mr. O'NEILL: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the discussion which has taken place in connection with matters having to do with returned men. There is one matter which has not been called to the attention of the committee. I refer to dependents' allowances for men who volunteer to serve in the reserve army and who may become injured. These men report for duty, say on Tuesday and Friday nights, and with the streets in the slippery condition they are now in, it is quite possible for one of these men to fall and break a leg or an arm. As I understand the situation, the regulations at present provide that the man would receive hospitalization and his pay allowance. In an extreme case it is possible for a man to be laid up for as long as four months. If he is a married man with two or three small children, he would be entitled to only his pay allowance of \$1.20 a day.

Provision should be made that, until such time as that man resumes his position in civil life, his dependents will be paid the same dependent's allowance as if he were on active service. A great many of the men in the reserve army are making less than \$125 a month and it is impossible for them to have anything laid by to provide for a lay-off of three or four months. Some consideration should be given to that phase of the question. There would not be very many to look after, probably half a dozen in any one military district in the course of a year. Has the minister given any consideration to that matter?

Mr. MACKENZIE (Vancouver Centre): I shall be glad to see that it is brought before the committee.

Mr. MACDONALD (Halifax): Is it the intention under the proposed legislation to extend the benefits of the Pension Act to groups who are not serving in the armed forces, to the dependents of men, for example, who are serving in Canadian ships and who may lose their lives at sea, not necessarily through enemy action but in the carrying-out of their duties in essential war services? I understand that provision is made by order in council for the dependents of those who lose their