

*By Mr. Brooks:*

Q. When you say "women" you mean "widows", I suppose?—A. Those qualified.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions, gentlemen?

*By Mr. Green:*

Q. On the Pensions Act, has the Legion given any consideration to section 3 of the bill, which is the one that takes away the right of action from the veteran and his dependents?—A. No, Mr. Green, we have not. There simply has not been the opportunity. I noticed a decision in the court about two months ago—I cannot remember the name of the case—and I rather suspect that this legislation is as a result of that decision, but we have not been able to give the matter any further consideration as yet.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions, gentlemen?

*By Mr. Gillis:*

Q. Mr. Chairman, there is one tangled up problem here, and that is the relationship of the unemployment insurance people to the administration of the section that provides he may take employment. I think we should have clarification on it while the Legion is here. My conception of it is that a veteran taking employment under the circumstances provided by this Act, will never be a recipient of unemployment insurance. For example, to establish a benefit year he has to have 180 payments—that will take him two years of practically continuous employment to do that. While he may be obliged to report for employment purposes to the unemployment insurance office, they keep a record of that, but he is not going to be unemployed long enough to transfer from war veterans' allowance to unemployment insurance as a means of income and I do not see any difficulty there except he has to report. I do not see why the unemployment insurance people should be brought into the picture at all. In most of the cities and towns in the country you have your D.V.A. set-up and they are staffed and a veteran going for war veterans' allowance may take employment for two or three or four months of the year and in my opinion that should be handled by the placement officers in the D.V.A. offices across the country rather than getting him tangled up with unemployment insurance.

Now, you have got General Burns here, Mr. Chairman. He is an authority on this matter and I would be obliged if he would give us a clarification on how that thing is going to be administered and how it might work for the benefit of the committee and the gentlemen of the Legion.

The CHAIRMAN: We are right back where we started a while ago. I have not any objection naturally to bringing General Burns in, and ultimately we will be very glad to do that, but we are abandoning what we said we were going to do, namely, the business of the Canadian Legion and their representations. Mr. Watts has already stated that provided the service is not diminished to the veteran, his organization takes no objection to that. I think it will basically be a matter of testing the efficacy of the practice by past experience. The actual experience we have to go on in that respect is the out-of-work benefits. If the committee wishes me to call General Burns to enlarge on that at the moment I have no objection—I am in the hands of the committee—but I point out to you we are beginning then a sort of discussion which we usually reserve until we have heard the evidence.

Mr. GREEN: I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. JUTRAS: Mr. Chairman, although I raised the point myself, I think the suggestion of the chairman is a good one. I can see that if we started questioning General Burns we are going to get away from the brief and we are going to