

War Veterans Allowance Act

deputy minister that it conveys the desire of the committee on that score, and that the thing which is desired to be done is being done. The permissible income remains the same.

Mr. KNOWLES: I understand what the committee did, and for the moment I am not arguing as to the facts of the case. I have pointed out that the committee transferred the \$120 from what was previously called a supplemental allowance and made it part of the allowance itself. The committee offset that transfer by making a reduction in the permissible income. But when they reduced the permissible income they did not reduce it by the same figure, \$120, they reduced it by \$125, hence the \$5 reduction.

Mr. GREGG: The permissible income remains exactly the same in the first draft and the draft now before the committee.

Mr. BRYCE: I should like to follow up what the hon. member for Nanaimo said regarding the amount of the pension. I hope that the minister will give consideration to the men of the first war who were not allowed to leave Britain. I have a typical case in my own constituency. This man went overseas in the early part of the war, in 1914. He was among the first to go over. He was employed in instructing officers in gas warfare. I am sure that the hon. member remembers those days. That man was not allowed to leave Britain. He is now back home. He has lived in Canada all his life. He is refused a pension because he was not out of Britain. I think the minister will probably admit that this is a deserving case, and there may be more than one.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): I should like to point out to the minister that in both clauses 3 and 4 these words are used: "Without child or children." Both the single and the plural are used. I take it that this means that a widow or widower, whether he or she has one child or six children would receive the same amount of allowance. The allowance would be exactly the same. Is that correct?

Mr. GREGG: That is correct.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): If that is correct, does the minister not think a widower with more than one child should have a permissible income of more than \$250 a year?

Mr. GREGG: I cannot very well answer the question offhand as to whether I consider it adequate. I do not think the item has been challenged by the committee, and I should like to see it carried as it is.

[Mr. Gregg.]

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): In the Pension Act there is a separate allowance for each child. Apparently the War Veterans Allowance Act does not recognize more than one child. The amount of the allowance is exactly the same. I am not quarrelling with that; but the widower is restricted as to the amount of money that he can earn without reducing his war veterans allowance. Surely a widower with several children should be allowed to earn more than \$250 a year without having his veterans allowance reduced. I do not think anybody would question that.

Mr. GREGG: I should like to point out that, compared with pensions, quite a different principle is involved here. In the case of old age pensions, there is no arrangement in any of the provinces for children. This is not intended to be more than some assistance for the veteran who needs it at that particular period of his life, and it is fair to state that there are not a great many who would come under that section owing to their age.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings-Peterborough): That may be true, but you should recognize the liability, because you are providing that a widow with a child shall get double the amount. If you recognize it for one child it is only reasonable to recognize it for the other children.

Mr. TUSTIN: I cannot see why these men should not be allowed to earn a little extra money. Two cases were brought to my attention last week. One man drew the burnt-out pension and he could do some light work. He has two children; his wife has been ill for some time, and he advises me that it is actually impossible for him to get by on the allowance he is receiving, being allowed to earn only \$250 in the year. I urge the minister to give further consideration to this provision.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): If a man with a 50 per cent pensionable disability dies of that disability his widow receive \$840?

Mr. MUTCH: The question the hon. gentleman asks relates to disability pensions. Under the War Veterans Allowance Act, it is not a question of degree of disability, since it is not strictly a pension in that sense but a living allowance. Therefore the question has no application to this specific act.

Mr. ROSS (St. Paul's): If a man has a disability of 50 per cent or more, his widow will receive the whole \$850. I think that is correct. Therefore a deadline is struck at 50 per cent. Why that is done no one seems to know. If a man has a 45 per cent disability which is pensionable, and he dies, the widow receives \$485. I do not see why there should be