

By Mr. Ross:

Q. Supposing the wife had lived, she would have received \$480 for herself and \$8 a month for each child and you think the sister should get the same?—A. If the responsibility of these children necessitates that the sister should give up her position and the income from it, she should get it, because that becomes her work.

Q. That is a special case?—A. It should not be considered as a special case; there should be some provision made to meet such cases for the reason that they exclude it now by saying, "There is no regulation covering that case." You can get it through if you can get some Minister to bring in an Order in Council providing for it. The question is, has the Pension Board the right to go outside the letter of the regulation?

Mr. ARCHIBALD: No, they have not.

WITNESS: In such cases as that there should be somebody who has the right to say, "You cannot keep your old mother and yourself and three children on \$48, it cannot be done." It is not necessary that the amount paid to the sister should be the amount paid to the wife, but it should be an amount which at least would enable her to keep the whole family in proper decency and comfort. The greater majority of the men who have returned to this country are not so anxious to get pensions; we have no desire to cheat the Government, but what we do want is a chance to be reinstated back into civil life at least on a basis as comfortable as we left when we went to serve the country.

The CHAIRMAN: That will be, of course, on the basis that if a man were in a good position and earning a good income it is necessary to put him in the same position and give him the same earning as before he left?—A. A maximum should be put on that; we do not want to be unreasonable at all, but we do think that a maximum should be fixed, so that a man may be assured that he will be able to live comfortably. Some people think that some of us were profiteers. We are not that at all; we want to get back into civil life; we are not interested so much in pensions except for the benefit of the men who come back disabled and who have to be provided for.

By Mr. Nickle:

Q. Provided there were two men, before the war, one earning \$1,000 and the other \$2,000; in that case would you give the man earning \$2,000 more than the other?—A. He ought to be given the same chance exactly as the other to make the same money by the same occupation, if there is room for him in it. I think every large industry ought to be made as its part towards the upkeep of the State to take these men into their service and train them. That has not come in Canada as yet, but it will come.

Q. My question was, whether you would give these men the same?—A. Not at all. I would give these men what their work was worth in the community, not the same, but I would give them a chance to train themselves so as to get a decent job. There is a great deal of talk about giving the returned soldiers jobs. Now, at the present time \$41.60 per month is all that some are getting in the service of the Government, but that is not sufficient to buy them enough food to keep them in good health. I do not think that the earning power of the man before the war should be taken, but I do think that they should inquire into a man's circumstances before he entered the service, and if they found that the man in the occupation he was in before the war was not able to earn a living commensurate with the present living costs, they ought to aid that man to raise himself up again.

By Mr. Cronyn:

Q. Is there not a great gulf between the basis upon which we are working and the basis which you are proposing? As I understand the basis of the present pension, it is a compensation to be awarded to the man having regard to his disability in the open market for labour, without regard at all to what that man might have earned in any prior occupation. Is it not just as well that we consider this a departure from

[Mr. Norman Knight.]